4.3.5

£1-0-0

J.W. Jones

APOSTOLICAL RECORDS.

3/6

G472a

APOSTOLICAL RECORDS

OF

EARLY CHRISTIANITY:

FROM THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION TO THE MIDDLE OF THE SECOND CENTURY.

BY THE LATE

REV. JOHN ALLEN GILES, D.C.L.,

Rector of Sutton, Surrey, formerly Fellow of C.C. College, Oxford,

AUTHOR OF "HEBREW AND CHRISTIAN RECORDS," ETC., ETC.

Πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ χρώμεθα.—II COR. iii, 12.

1003

LONDON:

REEVES & TURNER, 196, STRAND, W.C.

MDCCCLXXXVI.

LONDON:
THOMAS G. JOHNSON, PRINTER,
121, FLEET STREET, E.C.

CONTENTS.

Chapter		Page
I.	Introduction—On the Authenticity, Genuineness, and Faithfulness of Historical Works	1
II.	Summary of the Acts of the Apostles	11
III.	Greeks—Gentiles—Heathens—Nations	38
IV.	Secular or Profane Authors	50
V.	Apostolical Fathers—(1) Barnabas, (2) Clement, (3) Hermas, (4) Ignatius, (5) Polycarp, (6) Author of the Epistle to Diognetus	58
VI.	The Canon of Muratori	72
VII.	Minor Writers of the Second Century	76

(1) Apollonius, 77—(2) Claudius Apollinaris, 79—(3) Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, 80—(4) Hegesippus, 81—(5) Melito, Bishop of Sardis, 85—(6) Pantænus of Alexandria, 88—(7) Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis, 89—(8) Pinytus, Bishop of Gnossus, 92—(9) Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, 92—(10) Quadratus, Bishop of Athens, 93—(11) Rhodon, 93—(12) Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, 94—(13) Aristides, 96—(14) Anonymous Elders, 96—(15) Agrippa Castor, 96—(16) Ariston of Pella, 96—(17) The Martyrs of Lyons, 96—(18) The Churches of Lyons and Vienne, 96—(19) The Council of Cæsarea, 96—(20) Synodical Letter of the Council of Lyons, 97—(21) An Anonymous Elder, 97.

CHAPTER PAGE

VIII.—Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatian, Theophilus, Hermias, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Apocryphal Writings, Sibylline Oracles, Clementine Recognitions, Clementine Homilies, Apostolical Constitutions 98

IX.—Superstition—Magic—Visions 107

X.—The Gift of Tongues 125

XI.—Christ's Second Coming—The Millennium . 136

XII.—Of Joseph and Mary, the reputed Parents of Jesus—His brethren James, Judas, Simon, and Joses—Other Jews bearing the name of Jesus—Jesus Barabbas 150

XIII.—The Twelve Apostles 168

XIV.—The Seven Deacons—Philip—Stephen—Nicolas 182

XV.—Andrew 193

XVI.—Simon—Peter—Cephas 196

XVII.—James, son of Zebedee 224

XVIII.—John, son of Zebedee 231

Gospel according to St John, 239—Epistles of St John, 246—The Revelation, 250.

XIX.—Philip 257

XX.—Bartholomew 261

XXI.—Thomas 263

XXII.—Matthew 266

XXIII.—James, son of Alpheus 277

XXIV.—Thaddeus, or Lebbœus, or Judas the brother of James 286

XXV.—Simon the Canaanite, or Zelotes . . . 291

XXVI.—Judas Iscariot 292

Matthias 301

XXVII.—The Four Evangelists—

§1. Mark 303

§2. Luke 309

CHAPTER PAGE

XXVIII.—St Paul and his Missionary Companions . . 317

§1. St Paul's first visit to Jerusalem, 321—§2. St Paul's second visit to Jerusalem, 326—§3. First Missionary Journey with Barnabas and Mark, 327—§4. St. Paul's third visit to Jerusalem, 330—§5. Second Missionary tour with Silas, 334—§6. St Paul's fourth visit to Jerusalem, 345—§7. Third Missionary Tour, 346—§8. St Paul's fifth visit to Jerusalem, 354—§9. St Paul at Cæsarea, 362—§10. The Voyage to Rome, 367—§11. Sojourn in the Island of Melita, 371—§12. Journey to Rome, 372

XXIX.—St Paul's Epistles 375

§1. Romans, 377—§2. I Corinthians, 390—§3. II Corinthians, 401—§4. Galatians.

Personal, Moral, and other Features of St Paul.

§5. Ephesians—§6. Philippians—§7. Colossians—§8. I Thessalonians—§9. II Thessalonians—§10. I Timothy—§11. II Timothy—§12. Titus—§13. Philemon—§14. Hebrews.

ERRATA.

Page 15, at bottom of page, [i, 9-11] not [i, 10-11].

Page 29, after quotation ending "refresh himself," put this—[xxvii, 1-3].

Page 30, Embarcation, *k*, not c.

Page 42, in second line from top, *seven*, not fourteen times.

Page 73, thirteenth line from bottom up, *ad urbes*, not "ab urbes."

Page 80, beginning of last line, *up*, not "us."

Page 132, quotation top of page, "Bid not to speak with tongues," [xiv, 39] not [39].

Page 214, twelfth line from top, "John, who was surnamed Mark and," *perhaps*, not "probably."

Page 224, Chapter xvii, fifteenth line down, "There are *seven*" (not eight) "named in the New Testament."

Page 335, bottom note, second line, "Chapters xx, 5—xx, 16," not xxi, 16.

Page 359, second line [xxiii, 3], not [xxii, 3].

Page 362, heading of paragraph, "9. Paul *two years* at Cæsarea," not "9. Paul at Cæsarea."

APOSTOLICAL RECORDS.

CHAPTER I.

Introduction—on the Authenticity, Genuineness, and Truthfulness of Historical Works.

IN our examination whether of ancient or modern writings, especially those about which doubts have been entertained and controversies have arisen, it is important to understand the different meanings which the words, *genuineness*, *authenticity*, and *truthfulness* convey. "When it "is said, (in the words of Lyall's Propædia Prophetica, p. 406,) "that a history is authentic, we do not merely "mean that it is genuine, that is to say written by the "author whose name it bears, but we mean that it con- "tains a *contemporary* account of *facts;* such an account, "that is, as was believed by those who lived at the "time when they are supposed to have happened: and "it is this assumption of the mind, which lies at the "bottom of the credit given to the historian, and not "simply an implicit belief in his veracity." In this passage we have a distinction strongly marked between the three qualities which are required in order to establish the credit of a writing on the most perfect basis. But the restriction imposed by the writer, from whom the passage is quoted, cannot be allowed to stand in all its fulness, and the less so from the weight which would necessarily belong to any opinion coming from so high an authority. A work is *truthful,* when it records events which undoubtedly have happened; but the name is not equally applicable, where the writer only believes those events to have happened. A work is *genuine,* only when it is certainly the production of the writer to whom it is ascribed; but it may reasonably be thought that a work is *authentic,* not only when it is contemporary and possibly of first-

class authority, but also when the facts of the history are founded upon good documents or other sound basis, even when the writer lived in a later age—we need not say how much later, than the events which he records.

A single illustration of this subject, in which the three terms, *genuineness, authenticity* and *truthfulness*, are concerned, will be sufficient for our present purpose. The history of the Second Punic War has come to us from the pens both of Livy and of Polybius, the former a Roman who wrote about the first year of the Christian era, the latter a Greek who began to write nearly 200 years before that date. That the histories which pass under these names are *genuine*, has never yet been doubted: but the *authenticity* of the two has not been equally substantiated. Whilst Livy has devoted his talents to produce a work of elegance and of surpassing interest to his readers as a work of art, he has not given us satisfactory information on what authority his statements rest, and this defect, seeing that his work in great part treats of events that happened many hundred years before his time, has led the world to receive his narrative as any thing but thoroughly authentic, although at the same time not necessarily false in all its details. On the other hand Polybius, who lived close upon the earliest events which he describes, is believed to have obtained his information by patient enquiry from those who were still alive, and had taken part in those events; while he was himself present at others which are related in the latter part of his history; and he is therefore justly considered to be, as much perhaps as is possible for any writer to be, a contemporary historian. For these reasons, whilst the work of Livy is held to be of less authority than it would otherwise possess, that of Polybius is received with respect, and is thought to be no less authentic than any other ancient or modern history whatever. That this difference of character suggests a different estimate of the truthfulness of the two writers, or at least of their works, seems to be too clear to need argument in this place.

That these remarks are sound and applicable to all books of general history will be readily admitted by every reader who possesses the least knowledge of the subject, whilst at the same time it has, almost up to the present day, been customary to exclude the Bible, both the Old and the New Testament, from any enquiry as to their authenticity, authorship, or genuineness, on the presumption

that, as regards the most important quality of all, truthfulness, they are above suspicion, and altogether exempt from all such treatment as other writings receive, and from such inferences as enquiry might justifiably deduce in the case of any other composition. But there are other points of view from which the contents of that venerable book are to be considered, and these require to be fully set forth before we direct our attention to those parts of it which form the subject of the present volume.

The records of religion, not only of the Jewish and of the Christian, but of all others alike, present a sad picture of a supposed fall from original righteousness, by which mankind has lost the divine favour, and sin been introduced into the world, where formerly virtue and happiness prevailed. But the discoveries of science present a view of our race and of its destinies altogether different—a view which, being of a physical as well as of a moral nature, describes a state rather of progress than of decay, and dates from a more remote age than that to which the Jewish and Christian records carry us back. It is true that the poets of Greece and Rome have fondly described a state of original perfection, terminating in a fall from purity into sin and wickedness, which called forth the vengeance of Heaven upon the transgressors, but these traditions would have met with less belief or even notice among mankind, if they had not seemed to derive support from the corresponding traditions of the Jews. There is indeed a large number of writers, who are far from admitting the evidence of the Classic poets to prove the truth of what the Jewish writings tell us, and who with equal force assert that the supposed authentic histories of the Jews are no less legendary than the poetic remains of heathen, whether western or oriental tradition, and indeed have even been derived from them. In support of this opinion it is urged that there has been a prehistoric and legendary period in the existence of all nations, that not only is the early history of the Grecian states and of early Rome burdened with fables, which no man of sense now believes, but that the modern states of Europe cannot trace back their origin with any claim of certainty or evidence beyond the time when they became known to the great empires out of which they have sprung. Nor is this view of the past limited to the Old World: it holds good of the American continent also; for the traditions of the various Indian races, ascending

at the most to three or four hundred years previous to the arrival of the European settlers, are as much loaded with fables as the far more ancient legends of the Eastern Hemisphere. And the medium, by which the traditions of all ancient nations have been conveyed to modern times is mostly of a poetic rather than of a strictly historic character. That this is simply what might be expected will be admitted by all who regulate their judgement by the slightest use of common sense. The absence of writing materials in primitive times, and indeed ignorance of the art of writing or even of an alphabet, must have been insuperable hindrances to the preservation of knowledge; every thing was trusted to the memory, and the memory found great aid from the use of language measured by rhythm, and at a later period ornamented by rhyme. It is evident that the knowledge of every past event, no matter what may have been its magnitude or importance, must have been preserved in the mind and by recitation alone, before some more efficient mode of recording was discovered. It would otherwise perish wholly from the earth, if all those who lived at the time should die before the account of it was taken down in writing or otherwise delivered to future ages by monuments, coins, statues, and such other devices as the ingenuity of man has contrived.

It is true that convulsions of nature leave conspicuous memorials in the ruin which they create, and in the debris which remain behind them; and the works of men may in their remains, such for instance as those of the Romans, which are still turned up throughout the greater part of Europe, convey to future ages striking evidence of the power and greatness to which those nations had attained. But such records of the past, however imperishable they may be, cannot communicate to us the movements of man's avarice, pride, or ambition; they cannot perpetuate the minute distinctions which separate the various races of the world; the numberless vicissitudes, which form the life and soul of written history, can in no other way than by the pen or by some similar agency be handed down to future ages, nor even by the pen at a time subsequent to that when the witnesses of them have perished. But many other appliances are needful to give effect to the agency of the pen itself. Sculpture on stone seems to have supplied the place of writing even to a late period. Stone gave way in its turn

to a variety of materials; burnt bricks, wooden tablets, leaves of trees, vellum, and parchment, were found serviceable, and it does not appear that the art of writing in conjunction with those materials, and regulated by an alphabet such as we now use, dates from an earlier period than the seventh or eighth century before the Christian era. We may therefore infer that the strongest evidence is needed to establish the authenticity and genuineness of books which date from a remote age, and have come down to us without that identification of their authors, which is generally received as the chief basis for the value attached to them and the estimation in which they are held. It has been maintained by many that there was a prehistoric period in the existence of the Jews as well as of other nations, and that poetry and fiction, even moral and religious fiction, have lent their aid to construct writings, from which many of the usual sources of information are excluded. Nor is this an unfounded supposition, for not only have both poetry and fiction contributed much to the early history of every people on the face of the earth, but in some cases the most audacious theories concerning the origin of a race have been accepted and have prevailed, until a wiser and more critical age has banished them to the realm of fiction, where they first had their origin. Thus for many centuries it was believed that the kings of Britain, before the invasion of the Saxons, traced their descent in an unbroken line to Brutus, son of Æneas, the Trojan prince, who is said by the poets to have founded the Roman, and likewise—so it would appear—the British monarchy in the far west. This belief has now for many years been exploded, and the history of those kings, written by Geoffrey of Monmouth, out of supposed earlier records, and once accepted as authentic even by some men of learning who ought to have known better, is now preserved in our libraries only to gratify the curiosity of antiquaries, and no longer to furnish information to those who study the history of their country.

But ancient history, properly so called, is not the only subject on which a critical enquiry is needful. Philosophy, of which Religion is a branch, began among mankind as early as the recording of past events. Every nation of the earth is found to have some theory concerning the supernatural world, connected generally with their own origin and their own country, and all the legends, which have been handed down to our times, turn on the existence of

superior beings, whose influence is felt either for good or evil by those tribes who believe in them and generally also worship them. Religion indeed enters into the composition of every ancient work; and remarkably so in the case of the Scriptures; the former portion of which, the Old Testament, presents the Almighty in constant communication, through the Priests and Prophets, and sometimes without their intervention, with even the most humble individuals of the Jewish nation. The New Testament is wholly a book dedicated to Religion, presenting no events of a purely secular or historical character, but limited to those events only which mark the life of our Saviour and of his apostles, with the doctrines and teaching which were delivered by them for the religious guidance of those who should become members of the Christian community.

Omitting for the present further allusion to this subject and recurring to the fact that the early annals of nations are mostly legendary, we may be allowed to enquire whether the view of a prehistoric period, such as I have named, may be admitted in the case of the Hebrews, as well as of other peoples. We have unfortunately no other book than the Bible to throw light upon this subject. The historian Josephus, living when the Jewish commonwealth was at an end, is known to have had the Hebrew writings before him, when he was compiling his work on the Antiquities of the Jews, and it is evident from many passages of that book that he tried to modify the more marvellous parts of the Pentateuch, that they might appear less incredible to other nations. In the first sentence of the Antiquities he tells us that a wind, and not the spirit of God, as we read in our bibles, blew over the face of the waters, whilst the earth was still in a chaotic state: and elsewhere it is difficult to reconcile the accounts of the Jewish and the sacred historians, unless we make allowance for the prehistoric or mythical, and perhaps allegorical element, which we find to enter into all primeval histories whatever. We are necessarily debarred by limits of space from enlarging on this subject, but it is indispensable to point out the various difficulties which surround an enquiry into the age and authorship of any portion of what is said to be the most ancient, and certainly is, from its universal reception, the most interesting book now in existence.

If indeed a less important book than the New Testament or any portion of its contents were the subject of this work,

we might dismiss from consideration the points of difference which are found to exist between ancient and modern histories, but these certainly require to be mentioned, because, although Europeans have softened down within the limits of probability and common sense the marvellous narratives in which their forefathers delighted, the Asiatics still retain all the enthusiastic love of the marvellous, which ever prevailed among their remote ancestors. The Arabian Tales, which passed current nine hundred years ago, and which ascribe to the reign of the Caliph Haroun al Raschid marvels no less striking than those which are found in the writings of the Jews, are still read with eagerness and as if they were true, by the Arabs and other Mahometans of the present day. But in the civilized countries of Europe, few such instances can be found: the writers of history, both Greeks and Romans, recognized the true spirit of their calling, and even Livy, whose pages contain numerous prodigies which are said to have happened at various times, is thought to have introduced these only to please the vulgar common people among whom such marvels still obtained credit.

It is indeed admitted by every man of intellect and of common sense that divine interference in a personal form had ceased among the Jews four hundred years before the Christian era, and it may without very great hesitation be surmised that even from the time when Cyrus was chosen by God to restore the Hebrew commonwealth, the divine favour was no longer bestowed upon that people, but that they were left to struggle through the storms and vicissitudes of the world like the other nations who had previously never been admitted into such manifest favour of the Almighty.

Except for the short space of time occupied by the ministry of Jesus and his disciples, no case of miracle can be established either among the Jews or any other people. This contrasts remarkably with the accounts of the Old Testament, in which the whole narrative and every page are impregnated with a sense of religion and of divine agency—although the character of the religion changes sensibly as the narrative advances, and the divine agency becomes clearer and more monotheistic, as the system of the Israelitish ritual becomes more clearly marked. The dramatic character of their early books admits the agency of God in a personal form, which less commends itself to the feelings of the moderns than of the ancients, and still

less to the understanding of European than of Asiatic nations.

But it is not necessary to interpret literally, as if they were transacted in a real drama, those passages even of the Old Testament in which God is represented talking with the patriarchs, as a man talks familiarly with his friends. It is not a very unreasonable opinion to entertain that the Hebrew writers have clothed the facts which they relate in this dramatic form, influenced by the power of imagination, which in the Orientals, ignoring the mental process, or as it is now the fashion to call it the *subjective*, has created those beautiful *objective* pictures both of fact and fiction, which have given pleasure to men as to children wherever they have become known. But it does not seem possible to give offence to the most credulous, if it were suggested that what is stated to have happened in reality, and subject to the testimony of the senses, should be understood to have passed in the minds of those to whom such outward personal action is by a figure of speech attributed. When we read in numerous chapters of Exodus, "And the Lord said unto Moses, &c." and these words are a prelude to long conversations, and also to promises of aid in the enterprises which Moses is told to undertake, it is not unreasonable to refer the substance of these dramatic descriptions to another source than a personal interview, and to ascribe the outward form of the narrative to the realistic bias to which the minds of the vulgar are disposed. Nor is the Bible thoroughly consistent with itself, unless we interpret God's personal intercourse with men in the manner here indicated, if at least we are to understand literally that Moses saw the Lord face to face, for we read in Exodus (xxxiii, 20), "Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see my face and live." Nor is this text lightly to be rejected in favour of others, in which both men and women are described as having been admitted into familiar converse with the Almighty. For, if Jacob gave the name of Peniel to the place, where he says that he had "seen God face to face," (Gen. xxxii, 30), we are assured by an equally competent authority St Paul, that God is the Lord of lords, "whom no man hath seen nor can see," (1 Tim. vi, 16).

In the observations which have here been made on the genuineness and authenticity of books and other writings, on the differences existing between those which are ancient and those which are modern, on the per-

manent bias of the Oriental mind towards the marvellous, and on the opposite tendency of western races to eliminate the miraculous from the province of history, it has been my object to prepare the way for a fair, candid and complete examination of the writings in which the early history of Christianity from the crucifixion of our Lord to the end of the second century is contained. In this enquiry those books which form the latter half of the Canon of the New Testament, together with the notices which occur elsewhere of Christ's immediate disciples and followers, will occupy the most prominent place, as they are undoubtedly the most interesting to Christendom; and the enquiry will concern not so much their truth, as their authorship, their genuineness, and the time at which they may with the greatest probability be supposed to have been written. To include in this enquiry the writings, which remain to us from the second century of our era, might possibly seem a superfluous task to those who do not carefully notice the difference between this and all other histories. It might be thought that the period of one hundred years, namely the whole of the first century from the birth of Christ, would be amply sufficient for gathering and recording all the facts by which Christianity was introduced and established among mankind. But this presumption cannot be maintained: there is no Christian work remaining of the first century, and although twenty eminent Grecian and Roman authors lived during that period, not one of them has named either of those Christian writers with whom it is said they were contemporary. Those who acknowledge this, need not deny the truth of those wonderful events which characterize the first hundred years of our era; but they may reasonably doubt that the books in which those events are related, could have been in existence during the life-time of those Grecian and Roman writers, to whom, if contemporary with themselves, those Christian books would undoubtedly have been of deep and absorbing interest. That the Apostolical Fathers, Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, either are not the authors of the works ascribed to them, or lived at a later date and are not the companions of the Apostles, is now the belief of most unbiased judges; that those works were written in the second and not in the first century is a better founded opinion; but this alone furnishes sufficient ground for extending such an

enquiry as the present to the latest period that can be taken consistently with the truth of events which no one would willingly call in question. It is also a true and important fact that in the second century of our era the Christian world, from the frontiers of India to the pillars of Hercules, was deluged with writings mostly composed after the model of those which form the Canon, but full of absurdities which, accepted possibly here and there as true, could not fail in the end to be consigned to the oblivion to which alone they were due.

The title of this work "Apostolical Records," may perhaps sufficiently denote that the four Gospels are not included in the scope of the present investigation: they have already formed the chief subject of a work* by the present writer, and will only be cited as authorities for the few incidents which they furnish respecting the twelve apostles and other persons who appear in the narratives whether historical or otherwise in the Acts; the Epistles, the Revelation, and other writings which belong to the Apostolic age and that which follows it down nearly to the 200th year of our era. It is true that such of these writings as are admitted into the Canon of the New Testament, have already been considered in the work just referred to, yet this was done to a limited extent, consistent with the dimensions within which that work was comprised, and not so fully as the importance of the subject demanded. We shall have to pass in review all that has been left from ancient writers, and whether it should appear that the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation belong like the Gospels or not to the second century, it will not be thought a crime, but good service to have endeavoured to elicit a sound and well founded judgement respecting the most important period of Universal History, in which occurred events of the greatest interest to all the human race.

---

* Hebrew and Christian Records, 2 vols 8vo, London.

CHAPTER II.

Acts of the Apostles.

It was not until the year five hundred and thirty-two that the custom of dating events from the birth of Christ was introduced by Dionysius Exiguus, an Italian monk of the sixth century, and it is said that Charles III, emperor of Germany, in 870, was the first who used the words Anno Domini in denoting the successive years which he had reigned. But the author of our present system of chronology was inaccurate in his calculation: for on comparing the total period of 532 years with the length of time obtained by the number of years which represent the reigns of the Roman emperors, and with other chronological data, it was discovered that a mistake of four years had been committed; and it resulted from this error, either that Jesus was born four years before A.D. 1, if he was contemporary, even for a short time, with King Herod, or that if he was born as generally supposed in A.D. 1, King Herod had been dead four years, and could not have committed the murder of the Bethlehemitish children with which so many other incidents are connected. It is necessary for our purpose to speak, although briefly, on this matter, because the space of four years, unaccounted for, may much modify the conclusions which we may arrive at in tracing correctly the lives and travels of St Peter and St Paul.

The latest and most accurate chronologist of the present age, in his Fasti Romani (p. 14), considers that our Lord was crucified in the year 29. His words are these.

"It will follow that the earliest date for the Passion is A.D. 27, "the latest is A.D. 30. It will be shown in the Appendix to be "most probable that the Nativity was in B.C. 5; that the "Ministry extended to a fourth Passover; and that the Pas- "sion and Ascension were in A.D. 29. The reasons will there "be given for rejecting the date of Hales, A.D. 31, and of Usher, "Blair, Dufresnoy, and Mr Cunninghame, who all assign the "Passion to A.D. 33."

This statement, coming from so eminent a scholar, who has gone so fully into the subject, will show the reader the neces-

sity of naming the difference of four years between the two dates which designate the year of the Crucifixion. The only accounts, which remain of Christianity for about 30 years after the Crucifixion, are found in the Acts of the Apostles, and as no fixed system of reckoning time during that space is observed in that book, it is manifest that the difference of four years in fixing the Crucifixion must materially modify the calculation of events which occur subsequently to it. We have a further source of difficulty in the loose manner of describing the intervals of time which elapsed between one event and another. We read at the end of the second chapter of the Acts, that

> They [the disciples] continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved.

How different is here the conduct of the people from the cry "Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas—Crucify him, crucify him!" which the same people are said to have uttered in the Gospel according to St Luke (xxiii, 18); whilst in another of the gospels we are told that all the disciples forsook Jesus and fled. If St Luke were the author both of the Acts of the Apostles, and of the Gospel which passes under his name, either he would have explained how such a sudden change was effected in the minds of the people, or else a much longer time had elapsed for the transactions which occupy the first two chapters of the Acts, so as to have rendered an explanation of such revulsion of feeling on the part of the people unnecessary. There are many other passages in this book in which the same uncertainty prevails as to the length of time occupied by the various events which are therein related: but in order to avoid a reference to these various passages in an unchronological order, it may be convenient to furnish the reader with a summary of the various narratives which form the subject matter of the Acts of the Apostles, and so save him the necessity of constantly referring to the New Testament itself, whenever any point of chronological or historical interest is concerned. In doing this, I will introduce a running commentary on those passages, showing what difficulties exist tending to invalidate the theory that the book of the Acts was written by a contemporary of those who either were the disciples and apostles, or received immediately from them an account of the miracles and other

wonderful incidents concerning their master, which the disciples and so many others had witnessed.

The Book of the Acts opens with a dedication to Theophilus, to whom is given a title the "Most Excellent," *kratistos*, which is thought by Gibbon to designate a man holding a civil or official dignity. If this be so, we might find it difficult to suppose that such a title would have been given to a Christian, even if there were any one of exalted station, within a few years after the first promulgation of Christianity, although it might be perhaps appropriately used towards a Theophilus who was the sixth bishop of Antioch about the year 171, when a certain hierarchy had been introduced or was being introduced into the Christian Church.

The first allusion in the narrative itself is to the ascension of Jesus which is said to have happened forty days after his resurrection from the dead, [i, 3-9], whereas the Gospel narratives, each differing from the others, are all of them at variance with the writer of the Acts as regards this interval of forty days, and they describe Christ's ascension into heaven as happening either on the same day as his resurrection from the tomb or at all events within a day or two of that event.

In the verse which immediately follows the mention of these forty days, we read that Jesus, "being assembled together with them [his disciples], commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father," [i, 4]. It might be thought that this command was not likely to be obeyed by the followers of one who had been so hastily arrested as a criminal and so summarily put to death in that very city. Nor would their fears be otherwise than intensified if the temper of the people at large, which was so violent towards their master and his doctrines, was likely to be equally violent towards his followers. There is no instance in Roman history of a man seized in the night, tried before the judge and put to death at 9 o'clock in the morning; nor can we accept the narrative as other than an imperfect record of the events which happened to our Lord. The people, it may be presumed, were not adverse to a doctrine, of which the object was to rescue them not only from their own sins and evil doings, but also from the tyranny of those who governed them. It is consistent with the general teaching of Jesus, that he should enter Jerusalem in triumph, for we know

that the people "heard him gladly," [Mark xii, 37], but it is most likely that those who a few days afterwards shouted Crucify him, crucify him! were only the satellites of the Scribes, of the Pharisees, and the Jewish aristocracy, and that the magistrates, choosing the darkness of night to execute their wicked designs, would use every exertion to put to death as soon as possible so obnoxious an enemy as Jesus. Nor is the conduct of Pilate the Roman governor inexplicable: he saw that the offence of which our Lord was accused, could hardly be interpreted as treason against the Roman emperor; but the accusers asserted that it was so, and they accused him also of blasphemy, and the Governor knew that the Jewish religion was closely connected with their internal government. He was therefore easily induced to listen to what his enemies, who were a powerful body, alleged to support the accusations against him, and he ultimately consented that the accused should be put to death. We are not told what was the effect on the mind and temper of the people at large, when, as the day advanced, it became known that the great Christian teacher was no more; but we know the variable temper of the mob, at one time furious to take vengeance for an offence real or supposed however slight, at another time indifferent, either really or apparently, for the greatest injury done to any of their fellows or to the people generally as a body. These remarks may perhaps explain the fact that Christianity seems, not to have been extirpated or even checked by the death of its Founder, but rather to have established itself as an important factor in the events which followed after the crucifixion.

We are informed in the Gospel according to St Luke [xxiv, 43], that Jesus ascended to heaven from Bethany on the same day that he rose from the dead, and in the evening after he had appeared to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus. He found the eleven disciples assembled in Jerusalem, where he gave them instructions not to leave Jerusalem until they were "endued with power from on high." After giving them these instructions, he led them out to Bethany, and was there "parted from them and carried up into heaven." This narrative would be complete and consistent with itself if it stood alone; but the narrative which we are now considering, as found in the Acts of the Apostles, gives a very different view of the events, and it is tolerably evident that the accounts given in the gospels have in the Acts been unscientifically amalgamated with the idea of the forty days, and that the one which we find in

this book, is a repetition of that given in the Gospel, with certain miraculous facts, such as in profane writings are ascribed to the agency of the mythical or legendary element. Jesus here again explains the command that they were to remain at Jerusalem, by adding that they were to "wait for the promise of the Father, which, *saith he*, ye have heard of me." It is not necessary to remark that this promise referred to the Comforter of which our Lord spoke, as we find not only as quoted from Luke, but also in four passages of the Gospel according to St John, in one of which are added the words "which is the Holy Ghost," (xiv, 26). But Jesus adds, "For John [the Baptist] truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." It is worthy of remark here that Jesus should quote the baptism of John as an illustration of the baptism by the Holy Ghost; for we are informed in the Gospel according to St John (iv, 1), that Jesus "made and baptized more disciples than John," and although this statement is qualified by the words which follow, "Though Jesus himself baptized not but his disciples," yet it would seem to require an explanation why Jesus should cite the previous rite and mission of John the Baptist, which had been superseded by his own mission, into which the rite of baptism had with greater breadth and significance been introduced.

But in no part of the Acts of the Apostles is any mention made of baptism as practised during our Lord's life by either him or his disciples: the baptism of John only is referred to, and it would seem that the followers of John the Baptist were sufficiently numerous to form a society separate from the Christian community, although in harmony with them; for we read that Apollos, who afterwards was "baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus (xix, 5)," had already preached and taught, "knowing only the baptism of John (xviii, 25)." In modern times it is thought irregular to repeat the rite over one who has already been baptized.

When Jesus had finished admonishing his disciples,

He was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight, and while they looked stedfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven [i, ~~10-11~~]. 9.11.

The disciples then returned to Jerusalem, and went into

an upper room, where all the eleven, as we are told, abode. Their names are given the same as in the Gospel according to St Luke, and both lists contain the same error; in both of them Judas is called the *brother* of James, notwithstanding that the Greek text the . . . . . of James requires the word *son* to be supplied and not *brother* in all such cases. The translator has been misled by the inscription prefixed to the General Epistle of St Jude, where he is styled in the Greek text the *adelfos* or brother of James: but the evident reply to this argument is that there is no proof that the author of the Epistle was the same Judas who was one of Christ's disciples. It must be admitted too that this Judas is unknown as an apostle to either of the first two gospels, which also have Simon the Canaanite instead of Simon Zelotes, as we read in St John's gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles, (i, 13). The eleven continued in the upper room to which they had retired, "in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren." (i, 13-14). All this occurred, it would seem, at the end of the forty days which Jesus spent on earth after his resurrection, and it is evident that if our Lord did abide for forty days, his disciples might have had sufficient time to retreat back to Galilee after the crucifixion, and again return to Jerusalem, that they might receive the promised gift of the Holy Ghost. This however is a mere conjectural mode of reconciling two narratives which are directly opposed the one to the other, and which never can be satisfactorily reconciled.

In the fifteenth verse of chapter 1, the chronology becomes uncertain through the use of an expression which denotes the late authorship of the book, the scanty information of the writer, and the hopelessness of ascertaining with any accuracy the dates or the sequence of the events. "In those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples," &c. It is added that the "number of names together were about an hundred and twenty:" that is, of those who had met on that occasion, not that the Christians throughout the city were so few. We are not told how long time had elapsed; but the reference to "those days" implies that a long interval had passed before the account of that meeting was committed to writing. The result was that of two who were proposed for election to supply the place of the twelfth disciple, Judas Iscariot, Matthias was chosen in preference to "Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus," [i, 23].

The first ascertainable date in the book which we are summarizing, is the Day of Pentecost, when they "were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance," [ii, 4]. In the year A.D. 33, if that was the date of the Crucifixion, Whitsunday, according to the modern mode of computation, was on or about the 24th day of May. As Whitsunday varies only about one month, the exact day is not important, whether we take 29 or 33 as the year of the Crucifixion. Nor does it much concern us to enquire whether the word *diamerizomenai*, as applied to *glossai* 'tongues' is correctly rendered by *cloven* or whether its meaning is that the tongues were *divided* or *distributed* among the disciples, one to each. Both interpretations have rather a dramatic and even materialistic look. It must of course be supposed that none but the twelve apostles were present; but the power of speaking with other than their own native tongues will recur hereafter to our notice.

The gift of tongues caused great sensation among the people, and soon afterwards—the length of time which intervened is not named—the multitude came together, and Peter, who had addressed the former meeting when a hundred and twenty had been assembled, now again came forwards, as it would seem, in the open air; for in his company was a large number besides the apostles, and he addressed his hearers thus: "Ye men of Judæa and all ye that dwell in Jerusalem, [ii, 14]." The speaker appealed to the people as having witnessed the marvellous acts of Jesus, and asserted that these had been foretold by the prophets, from whom, especially from Joel and the Psalms of David, he quotes several passages in support of his teaching that Jesus was their expected Messiah.

The result of Peter's preaching, we are told, was that

They that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. . . . And all that believed were together and had all things common; and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the Temple and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God and having favour with all the people. And the

Lord added to the Church daily such as should* be saved (ii, 41-47).

The next event recorded in this book is the visit of Peter and John to the Temple at the hour of prayer described as the ninth hour, which according to the Roman and Grecian calendar was about three o'clock in the afternoon. The miracle of healing the lame man which then took place, furnished to St Peter a second occasion for pointing out to the people that Jesus was the Christ. On this occasion Peter again addressed the people, telling them that it was not their own power by which they performed such miracles, but the power of Jesus the Prince of life, whom they had put to death. And in this address, following a custom, which has since prevailed to a greater extent in the Church, Peter quotes from the Old Testament words of Moses as prophetic of Jesus, which were in fact only applicable to Joshua, but suitable to the purpose of Peter. In those words Moses warns the people that a successor should be appointed to lead them, even as he Moses had done:

The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken. [Deut. xviii, 15.]

But St Peter quotes these words as intended by Moses to apply to Jesus Christ, whereas they were applied to Joshua who succeeded Moses in governing the people; and they have been quoted ever since as describing the parallel between the lawgiver of the Israelites and our Lord, the lawgiver of the New Israel, which was to consist of all who were admitted into the New Dispensation, the Christian Community. The result of this address was similar to the preceding as regards the spread of the new religion, for their number was now "about five thousand."

But the priests, and the captain of the Temple, and the Sadducees came upon them, and laid hands upon them, and put them in hold unto the next day. *But* it came to pass on the morrow that their rulers, and elders, and scribes, and Annas the high priest, and Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest, were gathered together at Jerusalem [iii, 7].

---

* *Tous sozomenous* is more correctly rendered "those who were saved," that is those who were rescued from their former state and converted to Christianity.

A council was held; the apostles Peter and John were brought before these rulers, reprimanded, cautioned no more to preach to the people in the name of Jesus, and then let go free. These magistrates feared the people: they confessed among themselves that a notable miracle had been performed on the lame man, and they knew how things stood: "for all men glorified God for that which was done." There was evidently a beginning of that upheaval of the people against the higher classes of society, which the Christian doctrines were likely to produce.

The apostles nothing daunted by the threats of their rulers again met in prayer to God.

> And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together: and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness. And the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul: neither said any of them that ought of the things which he professed was his own, but they had all things common. . . . And Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas, (which is being interpreted Son of Consolation) a Levite, and of the country of Cyprus, having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles' feet (iv, 31-37).

These events probably occurred within a short space of time, but the exact date cannot be ascertained. The community of goods however was not pleasing to all who joined the new religion. Ananias and Sapphira, we are told, prevaricated in their statements, and were struck dead by Peter with the lie in their mouths, without attracting the notice of the Roman governor, who certainly in every such case might be expected to enquire into the circumstances of an act so wholly subversive of imperial if not of municipal government—to say nothing of the friends of the deceased.

Meanwhile "by the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people," and when we read in the same sentence that "they were all with one accord in Solomon's porch (v, 12)," it is strongly suggested to the mind that the work which we are reviewing is fragmentary; for no reason is given or occasion stated for their being assembled in such a public place. The apostles continued to work miracles, and even the shadow of Peter was supposed to be efficacious in healing the numerous sick persons, brought from the neighbouring villages, if they were so laid that it could fall upon them.

Then the high priest rose up and all that were with him, (which is the sect of the Sadducees,) and were filled with indignation, and laid their hands on the apostles, and put them in the common prison. But the angel of the Lord by night opened the prison doors, and brought them forth and said, "Go, stand and speak in the temple to the people all the words of this life. (v, 17-20.)

It might be thought unhistorical to suggest that some members of the Christian society were the means by which God released his ministers from prison, if it were not well known that the Almighty acts generally through the agency of man in his dealings with our race; of which numberless instances might be cited from the Old Testament, represented, as in the present instance, under the dramatic description of personal agency. However this may be, the Jewish authorities were surprised in the morning that those whom they had left in the prison, were now preaching in the temple, and the apostles were again brought before the Council. Here their arguments again prevailed, their enemies "were cut to the heart and took counsel to slay them (v, 33)." From this fate they were saved by the intervention of Gamaliel, a Pharisee, who cautioned the rulers not to molest the apostles, for that their doctrine, if false, would die away of its own accord. In illustration of his meaning he reminded them that the similar attempts of Theudas and "Judas the Galilean in the days of the taxing" had been brought to naught [v, 34-2]. But in recording this speech the writer of the Acts has given latitude to his own imagination, and has committed a grave historical error. When Gamaliel gave his wise advice to the Jewish Sanhedrim, he could not possibly refer to the insurrection of Theudas, which in fact had not then taken place. We learn this from Josephus.

Whilst Fadus was governor of Judæa, [*i.e.* in the fourth year of Claudius, A.D. 44] a certain magician [*impostor*], Theudas by name, persuades the greater part of the multitude to take their goods and follow him to the river Jordan. For he said that he was a prophet, and told them that he would divide the river by his command, and afford them an easy passage: and by saying this deceived many. Fadus however did not suffer them to reap the fruits of their folly; but sent against them a troop of cavalry, which falling on them unexpectedly slew many of them, and took many alive. They captured Theudas alive, and cut off his head and carried it to Jerusalem. *Antiq.* xx, v, 1.

Thus it appears that Gamaliel quotes an incident which did not happen until about ten years afterwards. Nor is the writer more fortunate in Gamaliel's reference to the insurrection of Judas, which happened not *after* but *before* that of Theudas. It is true, as Josephus tells us, that among those who were put to death immediately after Theudas, were also "the children of Judas the Galilean, who led the people to revolt from the Romans, when Cyrenius was the valuer in Judæa." *Antiq.* xx, v, 2. Thus Gamaliel quotes as recent a fact which had happened forty years before, misled by the name; but no other proof is wanted to show that the writer of the Acts of the Apostles has ornamented his narrative, like the historians Thucydides and Livy, not always successfully, by placing in the mouths of his characters speeches which he thought likely to have been spoken under the circumstances in which they were placed.

The apostles preached daily in the Temple, the Christian community increased largely, and even "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith (vi, 1-7)." The Greeks, whoever these were, murmured against the Hebrews, complaining that their widows had not an equal share with the native Jews, and seven deacons were appointed to serve at the tables of daily ministration. Their names were Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolas (vi, 5), not one of whom bears a Hebrew, but all of them Greek names, and their office, which was equivalent to that of a minister or serving man, has been exalted, like the names of bishop and priest, by the retention of their Greek name to a meaning altogether different from its original.

Stephen, the first named of the deacons, "did great wonders and miracles among the people:" but his enemies seem for the moment to have checked the public zeal which hitherto had supported the Christians.

There arose certain of the synagogue which is called the synagogue of the Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and Asia, disputing with Stephen. And they were not able to resist the wisdom, and the spirit by which he spake. Then they suborned men which said, "We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and against God." And they stirred up the people and the elders and the scribes and came upon him and caught him, and brought him to the council. And set up false witnesses, which said, "This

man ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place and the law. For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered us." And all that sat in the council, looking stedfastly on him, saw his face as it had been the face of an angel (vi, 9-15).

Stephen's defence of himself occupies the whole of the seventh chapter. He was stoned to death outside of the city, and "the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul (vii, 58)."

From the eighth chapter we learn that the rulers succeeded for a time in successfully persecuting the new sect, and Saul, hitherto only named in the narrative of Stephen's death, appears now as their agent. As he is here first mentioned, and from this time appears prominently in the history, it is remarkable that the writer should not have at once stated that Saul and Paul were the same man. It is only in the ninth verse of the thirteenth chapter that we read of Saul "who also is called Paul," in the contest which took place in Cyprus between him and Elymas the sorcerer. It is for these and other reasons that many regard the Acts of the Apostles as a book compiled from two separate documents blended into one, and having a preface attached to it, in order to give an appearance of uniformity to the work. From this point I shall summarize more briefly the remaining chapters of the Acts, because under the head of Peter, John, Paul, James, and others we shall have to recur more minutely to their history as related in this book, as almost the only document we have remaining, and to compare the accounts there given with the Epistles and other writings of which they are the reputed authors.

The rest of the eighth chapter is occupied by the incident of Simon Magus who offered money to Peter and John, that he might obtain the same miraculous powers which they possessed; and by the narrative of Philip and the eunuch, who had come to worship at Jerusalem,* and was baptized by Philip on his way home through the desert to Ethiopia.

The ninth chapter opens with the mission of Saul from the high priest at Jerusalem to the synagogues in Damas-

* Jerusalem has always been regarded as a holy city, not only by Jews and Christians, but by its heathen neighbours; and still is so by the Arabs and other Mahometans who call it *El Kadoosh*, which I suppose is the Kadytis of the Greek historian Herodotus.

cus, that he might bring bound all of the Christian sect whom he found there, back with him to Jerusalem. We have then an account of his miraculous conversion described in the words of the author of the book. According to the narrative which follows, Saul began at once to preach at Damascus in the synagogues the very doctrine which he went there to persecute. We shall have to recur farther on to the account of Saul's conversion. The history next tells us that he narrowly escaped from the hands of the Jews, and went to Jerusalem, where after some hesitation on the part of the Christians there, he was admitted into their community, but for fear of the Jews he was sent away to Cæsarea and thence to Tarsus (ix, 1-30).

Peaceful times now followed, and Peter "passed through all quarters," (ix, 32), healing Æneas at Lydda, and at Joppa raising to life Tabitha otherwise called Dorcas, who was dead, (ix, 40). From Joppa he was summoned to Cæsarea by Cornelius a devout man, and a "centurion of the band called the Italian band, and whilst the messengers were on their way, he saw the vision of a vessel let down from heaven, wherein were all kinds of animals, and he heard a voice telling him to kill and eat. He was warned no longer to attach importance to the exclusive habits of the Jews as regarded their food and social customs, but to accompany the messengers of Cornelius. The family of this centurion were converted, and, filled with the Holy Spirit, began to speak with tongues and magnify God. But the circumcized Jews who believed, as many as came with Peter, were astonished, "because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost (x, 45)."

These doings however offended the "apostles and brethren that were in Judæa," (xi, i) until Peter explained the vision and the events of his journey, which satisfied the Jewish Christians for the moment, but we know from other sources, and shall have to recur farther on to the fact, that the Christian community at Jerusalem for nearly 200 years did not cordially fraternize with the converts in other parts, especially after the latter became united under the leadership and definite teaching of St Paul.

We now read as follows, of Barnabas, about the year 43 A.D., if the crucifixion was in 33, and of course earlier or later according to the date which we affix to the event with which it is connected.

Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus, for to seek Saul, and when he had found him, he brought him to Antioch. And it

came to pass that a whole year they assembled themselves with the church and taught much people. And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch. And in those days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch; and there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar. Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judæa: which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. (xi, 25-30.)

Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hand to vex certain of the church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. (xii, 1-2.)

Peter also was arrested a second time in this persecution, because, as we are told, Herod "saw it pleased the Jews." This expression however must be limited to the courtiers and upper classes of the Jews, and cannot be extended to the populace; for, as we have seen, they heard the Christian doctrine with favour, and many thousands of them had joined the community. And the mode in which Peter was released this second time, if not a reduplication of the former event, suggests that the zeal of the brotherhood might have effected the same result, whilst the ministry of angels would give greater solemnity to a proceeding, by which the power of the bigoted and tyrannical magistrates was set at nought.

The death of Herod follows: "he was eaten of worms and gave up the ghost" (xii, 23), but the historian tells us that "the angel of the Lord smote him." It may be said without much cavilling, that God smites every one who dies, but the angel which deals the blow is not generally visible to the human eye, although such has been the belief of the Eastern nations, if we are to take literally the narratives which have come down to us from those dramatic and imaginative peoples. We may probably interpret in a similar manner the various other messages of angels, whether to warn Cornelius that he should send for Peter, or to warn Peter about the difference between clean and unclean animals which was to be abolished by the universality of the Christian doctrine.

When Barnabas and Saul had fulfilled their mission to Jerusalem, they returned to Antioch, and "took with them John, whose surname was Mark" (xii, 25): and we here enter upon another series of events, presenting features

which indicate a different author, who would seem in two or three passages of the narrative to have been present and to have taken a part in the events which he relates.

The thirteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles is prefaced by the statement which follows.

Now there were in the church which was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul. As they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them." And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them they sent them away. . . . . They had also John to their minister (xiii, 1-5).

The missionaries visited Seleucia, Salamis, and Paphos, cities of Cyprus, where they had a rencontre with one Barjesus otherwise called Elymas a sorcerer. This man was connected in some way with Sergius Paulus the deputy, *i.e.* the proconsul of the island; and as he is termed a false prophet in the Acts, we may infer that he professed to foretell future events and was consulted by the proconsul, as the augurs were by the consuls and other magistrates at Rome. But the new teachers, whom now Sergius Paulus wished to hear, were opposed by Elymas, and when Saul struck him with blindness, the proconsul professed himself a convert.* It is in the relation of this miracle that we read for the first time "Saul who is also called Paul," (9), and it is also embarrassing that we have no information about that John whose surname was Mark, and who accompanied the missionaries as their minister, or rather servant, for the Greek word is here not *diaconos* but *hupērĕtēs*. The names attached to the various apostles and others who first promulgated Christianity, present great difficulty in discriminating them, and indicate that the information which the writer possessed was very imperfect, the real facts having become obscured by time. At

---

* Is it not marvellous that the stupendous miracles recorded almost everywhere in both the Gospels and the Acts, should have made little or no impression on the minds of those who are said to have witnessed them? The Roman governor Sergius Paulus and Cornelius the centurion may be contrasted with King Agrippa, with Felix, who put off Paul to a more convenient season, and with Gallio the proconsul, who drave the Christian and Jewish litigants from the judgement seat.

Perga in Pamphylia John left them and returned to Jerusalem (13).

They depart from Perga to Antioch, where Paul preaches in the synagogue on the two following sabbaths, (xiii, 14). Being persecuted by the Jews, they shake off the dust from their feet and depart to Iconium (51).

They preach at Iconium, but, "when there was an assault made both of the Gentiles, and also of the Jews with their rulers," they flee to Lystra and Derbe. (xiv, 1-6).

At Lystra Paul cures a lame man; the people take him and Barnabas for gods, but by the intervention of some Jews from Antioch and Iconium, their minds are turned, and they stone Paul, leaving him for dead. On his recovery, he and Barnabas depart to Derbe, thence back to Lystra, Iconium, Antioch, Perga, Attalia (25), and back to Antioch, where they "abode long time with the disciples." (xiv, 8-28.)

Paul and Barnabas, passing through Phenice and Samaria, go up from Antioch to Jerusalem to consult the church about circumcision, and return to Antioch taking with them Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas. (xv, 1-35). A.D. 51. The discussion which took place at Jerusalem will be hereafter noticed. Judas and Silas are described as prophets (32).

Paul sets out on his second tour, but quarrels with Barnabas about John surnamed Mark. Barnabas takes Mark and sails to Cyprus. (xv, 36-39).

Paul proceeds on his journey, in company with Silas: they visit Derbe and Lystra where they fall in with "a certain disciple named Timotheus," whose father was a Greek, and his mother a Jewess. Thence passing through Phrygia, Galatia, Mysia, Troas, they cross to Samothrace, Neapolis, Philippi (where Paul cast out from a woman a spirit of divination, xvi, 12: and was imprisoned with Silas, but released after the shock of an earthquake), Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica, Berœa, xvii, 18: Athens, and Corinth, where they "found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla, because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome." (xviii, 2.)

The date for these events is given A.D. 54 in the margin of our Bibles; but the emperor Claudius died in that year, and Josephus in his Antiquities (xix, 5, 3) tells us that the emperor Claudius published an edict in favour of the Jews. The only support which the classic writers furnish about the

expulsion of the Jews from Rome is found in Suetonius (*Claudius* 25) "Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit," but the brevity and isolation of that passage, together with the unusual name *Chresto*, contribute to throw much obscurity over the edict by which the Jews were expelled.*

The missionaries remained at Corinth one year and six months. Here Gallio, being proconsul of Achaia, gave the memorable decision not to interfere in any of the Jewish quarrels about religion (xviii, 14). Paul abode with Aquila and Priscilla, and exercised his craft of tent-making: at Kenchreæ he sheared his head, having a vow. He then visited Ephesus, Cæsarea, and Antioch, where he spent some time (23) but, as he had "tarried yet a good while" at Corinth beyond the eighteen months already mentioned, we lose entirely the thread of the chronology, and can only obtain an approximation to the year in which these events took place.

From Antioch, which is clearly superseding Jerusalem as the head-quarters of Christianity, Paul, who latterly seems to have left the other missionaries and to have acted more on his own responsibility, "went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order," and came to Ephesus, where he spoke boldly for the space of three months in the synagogue and then "disputed daily in the school of one Tyrannus—by the space of two years." He then visits Macedonia, (xx, 1): Greece, where he abode three months, Philippi, Troas, Assos, (xx, 13): Mitylene, Chios, Samos, Trogyllium, Miletus, Ephesus, (xx, 17): Coos, Rhodes, Patara, Tyre, (xxi, 3): Ptolemais, Cæsarea, Jerusalem, where he was led before the chief captain Claudius Lysias, who asked him if he was not that Egyptian who had "led into the wilderness 4000 men that were murderers, &c." (xxi, 38).

Paul makes his defence, but owing to the clamours of the Jews, they are on the point of scourging him, until it is known that he was a Roman citizen; upon which he is on the morrow set free from his bonds and again examined, the next day, face to face with his accusers (xxii, 1-30).

Ananias the high priest, commanding to smite Paul, is

* Dion Cassius [lx, 6] tells us that Claudius did not drive out the Jews, who swarmed to such a degree that they could not be excluded from the city without trouble on account of their numbers, but he commanded them to follow their national mode of life and not meet together in crowds.

rebuked by Paul, who does not know that he is the high priest. The Jews conspire to kill Paul, but through his sister's son information thereof is sent to Claudius Lysias, who sends him down to Cæsarea (xxxiii, 1-35).

He appears before Felix, and is left bound two years, until Festus was sent to succeed Felix (xxiv, 1-27).

Paul, having been heard by Festus and King Agrippa, appeals to Cæsar. The hearing occupies the whole of chapters xxv and xxvi. He is then sent on board ship for Rome, and on his arrival at that city, he dwelt "two years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence, no man forbidding him." Chapters xxvii and xxviii.

According to the dates given in the margin of our Bible, the voyage of St Paul began in the year A.D. 62, but this is on the supposition that the crucifixion took place in 33. If however this happened in 29, we obtain 58 as the date of St Paul's embarkation for Rome. To these numbers may be added for the voyage one year, seeing that three months were spent in the island of Melita, besides the slow navigation of ancient vessels, and the other stoppages which merchant vessels in those days frequently encountered in so long a voyage. We thus obtain the year 59 for the arrival of St Paul at Rome, and 61 as the date when the book of the Acts is abruptly terminated by the statement that he spent those two years "preaching the kingdom of God and teach-"ing those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ "with all confidence, no man forbidding him."

Having thus completed our summary of the book now under review, we have only to enquire how far the received opinion is true, which ascribes its authorship to St Luke, and its age, consequently, to the very lifetime of the original apostles. Not that St Luke himself has ever been regarded as one of our Lord's original disciples: the only notices of him in the New Testament are in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv, 14); in the second Epistle to Timothy (iv, 11), and in the Epistle to Philemon (24). In the first of these we read, "Luke the beloved physician and Demas greet you;" in the second, "Only Luke is with me;" and in the third he is called Lucas, one of the fellow labourers of St Paul. His history therefore is almost as obscure as

that of Matthew, and Mark, to whom the authorship of other two Gospels is ascribed. That Luke was in company with St Paul when the latter wrote those words in epistles sent from Rome to the Colossians and to Timothy, would be a safe inference from the salutation which St Luke sends to the Colossians by the handwriting of St Paul, and from the statement which Paul makes to Timothy that St Luke is the only one remaining in his company. But that St Luke is the writer of the Acts of the Apostles is not so easily inferred from his being in the company of St Paul at Rome, although it is barely possible, but hardly likely, if we follow the account of those who embarked in the ship, that he who wrote the latter part of this book, had accompanied the Apostle of the Gentiles throughout the perilous voyage and shipwreck which they went through before they arrived at the Imperial City. This would be a reasonable inference from the repeated occurrence, in the narrative of St Paul's voyage, of the personal pronoun *we*, which does not occur in the early half of the book: but it would not be safe to take for granted that the Roman governor, who sent Paul to be tried before Cæsar, would allow him to take his friends and adherents with him in the ship at the expense of the Roman government. We shall hereafter recal to memory that a similar statement in the case of Ignatius has been one powerful reason for doubting the truth of the accounts in which that statement has been handed down in the Church. The whole narrative of St Paul's embarcation tells strongly against the supposition that Luke "the beloved physician" sailed with him from Palestine: it is given at the beginning of the twenty-seventh chapter, thus:

> And when it was determined that we should sail into Italy, they delivered Paul and certain other prisoners unto one named Julius, a centurion of Augustus's band. And entering into a ship of Adramyttium, we launched, meaning to sail by the coasts of Asia; one Aristarchus, a Macedonian of Thessalonica, being with us. And the next day we touched at Sidon. And Julius courteously entreated Paul, and gave him liberty to go unto his friends to refresh himself. XXVII. 1. 3.

That the Roman officials of rank were willing to treat Paul and other Christians courteously, is manifested by many instances. The governors Festus and Felix, and also King Agrippa treated them with gentleness and with contempt: and Gallio, even whilst indignant at the waste of

time which their disputes entailed upon him, did no more than dismiss them from the court. And now Julius treated Paul courteously, and allowed him to go ashore and see his friends that he might refresh himself from the fatigues of his voyage; which would not lead us to infer that he had friends in the ship with him. Moreover we read in the passage above cited, who were the passengers on board the ship with Paul: they were "certain other prisoners," and "Aristarchus a Macedonian of Thessalonica." Who this man was we are not fully informed: all we know of him, beyond the fact that he went to Rome in the same vessel with St Paul, is derived from the slender notices of him which occur in two other passages of the Acts, and in two of the Pauline epistles.

And the whole city [*Ephesus*] was filled with confusion: and having caught Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel, they rushed with one accord into the theatre (Acts xix, 29).

And there accompanied him into Asia Sopater of Berœa; and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus; and Gaius of Derbe, and Timotheus; and of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus (Acts xx, 4).

Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner saluteth you, and Marcus sister's son to Barnabas (Col. iv, 10).

There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus, Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-labourers (Philemon, 23-24).

Aristarchus, in one of these extracts, is called the fellow-prisoner of Paul, in the other his fellow-labourer in contradistinction to another named Epaphras, who is designated as his fellow-prisoner. In the other two extracts he is simply named as a man of Macedonia, of Thessalonica, who accompanied Paul in his travels through various parts of Asia.

That he was caught by a mob in Ephesus does not lead to the inference that he was a prisoner, like Paul, in the hands of the Roman magistrates, nor is he named as a prisoner in the account given of their embarcation: it is only in the Epistle to the Colossians, that the writer of that epistle calls him his fellow-prisoner; and this epistle, they say, was written afterwards at Rome. In the account of their embarcation on board the ship of Adramyttium, he is named separately and distinct from some other prisoners, who are not thought worthy of being named at all. If

however Aristarchus, as we have no wish to doubt, did travel in the same ship with Paul to Rome, did Lucas, *i.e.* Luke, accompany him also, and if so, why is he not mentioned in the list of those who embarked with the apostle in the ship of Adramyttium? If he did accompany St Paul, he was evidently thought unworthy to be mentioned by name. Notwithstanding these difficulties, the authors of the *Life and Letters of* St Paul have given us an account of the matter, which I deem it expedient to extract in their own words.

St Paul's two companions—besides the soldiers, with Julius their commanding officer, the sailors, the other prisoners, and such occasional passengers, as may have taken advantage of this opportunity of leaving Cæsarea,—were two Christians already familiar to us, Luke the Evangelist, whose name, like that of Timotheus, is almost inseparable from the Apostle, and whom we may conclude to have been with him since his arrival in Jerusalem,—and "Aristarchus the Macedonian, of Thessalonica," whose native country and native city have been separately mentioned (Acts xix, 29, xx, 4) and who seems from the manner in which he is spoken of in the Epistles written from Rome (Philem. 24, Col. iv, 10) to have been, like St Paul himself, a prisoner in the cause of the Gospel. (Conybeare and Howson's Life and Epistles of St Paul, London, 1868, vol. ii, page 332.)

It is needless to point out how far conjecture has in this passage supplemented fact. There is nothing in any part of the New Testament, which even by inference allows us to state that Luke accompanied Paul in his journey to Rome; but reasoning far more powerful than conjecture compels us to add that there is nothing to show that he wrote the book which relates the Acts of the Apostles. Various arguments combine to establish this inference, besides those which have been briefly named already.

In the first place, even if we are to believe that the author of the third gospel was also the writer of the book which bears the title of Acts of the Apostles, it still remains to enquire who that writer was: for both of those books are anonymous, and there is no mention of St Luke or of his writings in any author sacred or profane for the space of 150 years from the crucifixion of Jesus until the latter half of the second century of our era.

In the writings of the Apostolical Fathers, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, who are said to have been contemporary with the apostles, no men-

tion is made of the book called the Acts, or of its reputed author St Luke; and it is now almost universally admitted that the Apostolical Fathers wrote the works ascribed to them at a later period, and were not contemporary with the apostles at all. A more explicit account of this subject has already been given in a previous work.

A second difficulty, as already stated, presents itself in the fact that Luke, the supposed author, has dedicated his work to Theophilus, who in the preface to the Gospel according to St Luke, is styled "most excellent:" and those who receive the two books as the undoubted work of that Luke, who is named in St Paul's epistles, and who is there named as being with St Paul at Rome, have always been at a loss to determine what man among the Christians was in such a dignified position as to be so entitled at such an early stage of the Christian history. If St Luke did not accompany St Paul to Rome, we may suppose that he was among the earliest converts who listened to the preaching of that Apostle, and if his name Lucas was only a short form of Lucanus, like Silas from Silvanus, he might even be a Roman born, and therefore still less likely to have written in Greek.

But the voyage of St Paul to Rome cannot have been later than the year A.D. 65, and was probably some years earlier. And if St Luke was converted to Christianity at Rome by St Paul, he would have known very little of the events which preceded that voyage, and it therefore is most improbable that he could have written the Acts of the Apostles, where St Paul is the chief actor, or, if he wrote that book at Rome, we must suppose that St Paul, whose energy in preaching the Gospel was unwearied, and who seems to have been both night and day intent upon that duty, did nevertheless communicate to St Luke the numerous events recorded in the Acts, notwithstanding that St Paul himself also was a stranger to all the events which preceded his own conversion, and which are minutely recorded in that book. Now it has been suggested (p. 13) that the Theophilus to whom this work was dedicated, is the same who was the sixth bishop of Antioch about the year 170 of the Christian era. But if St Luke wrote his book at Rome, it might be said that Theophilus was a Roman of distinction, to whom, as a convert to Christianity, St Luke paid the honour of dedicating the work. But here the Gospel ascribed to the same Luke, again interposes a difficulty: the writer states the object which he had in

view by dedicating that work to Theophilus: "That thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed." (LUKE, i, 4.)

These words render it difficult to believe that Theophilus could have been a Roman convert, although the difficulty is not so evident to the reader of the English version: for the Greek word *katēchēthēs*, rendered "thou hast been instructed," is generally applied to younger persons, formerly termed *catechumens*. The definition of this name is thus given in a recent work of reference:

> One who, convinced of the truths of Christianity, is under instruction in preparation for baptism. LEE'S *Glossary of Liturgical and ecclesiastical terms.*

This could hardly have been said of a dignified Roman citizen, recently converted; although it might with propriety be carried back to the early years of a convert, who in process of time had been raised to the rank of bishop in the city of Antioch.

The difficulty we here encounter may be otherwise expressed in few words. It is conceivable that Luke was a Roman, and that he was one of those who were converted by St Paul at Rome; but in this case it is not conceivable that he could have compiled the Acts of the Apostles, as the preface to that work asserts of its author, out of previous uncanonical and less authenticated Acts, many of which still remain, all written in Greek and deriving their origin from the Eastern not the Western empire. Nor is it conceivable that Theophilus was converted at Rome at so early a date. St Paul had, I believe, enough to do to protect himself and the whole Christian community from the cruelty which the emperor Nero practised towards them, and I believe that he and others perished in the persecution which they encountered because they were suspected of having set fire to Rome during the reign of that emperor, as is related by Tacitus the Latin historian. The whole tenour of the narrative in all the gospels indicates a time of tranquillity, as the only time in which those thoughtful and sublime biographies could have been composed.

The tenour of the two prefaces especially, said to have been written by St Luke, is opposed to the assumption that the Theophilus designated as Most Excellent lived at so early a date, and consequently to the supposition that St Luke wrote those books. There had already been numerous Gospels, such as the Gospel of the Hebrews and perhaps

others, before the publication of those which are in our canon, and the correct translation of the preface to the third of those which are canonical, shows that its author does not profess to be an original writer, or to "have had perfect understanding of all things from the very first," which is the erroneous rendering of our authorized version, but that he follows the accounts of others, who "were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." It is worth while to give the whole preface more correctly translated; and that form of it, to which the English reader is accustomed, must no longer be pleaded in support of the contemporary character of either the Gospel or the Acts of the Apostles.

Authorized Version.	Corrected Version.
Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things, which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them to us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed.	Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a NARRATIVE of those things, which HAVE BEEN BROUGHT TO FULFILMENT IN US, even as THEY, WHICH from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word, have HANDED DOWN TO US, it hath seemed good to me also, FOLLOWING ALL ACCURATELY FROM THE BEGINNING, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed. (Luke, i, 1.)

If then these words render it unlikely that the authorship of the Gospel should be ascribed to St Luke, or any other contemporary of the Apostles, it naturally follows that the Acts of the Apostles also must have had some other author, and we necessarily revert to the sixth bishop of Antioch, Theophilus, who lived in the latter half of the second century, when the idea of a bishop had expanded into dimensions approaching more nearly to those of the present possessors of that dignity, and in a city famous as the cradle of Pauline Christianity which now is so widely spread. It is notorious that St Paul resided in that city whenever he paused from his labours of preaching, that the disciples were first called Christians there, and—may we not add, that a part at least of the Christian Scriptures owe their origin to the community who there resided? It is consistent with every

known fact that some one, whose name has not come down to us, should have dedicated to his ecclesiastical superior one or both of the two works which we have been here considering.

To the foregoing arguments may be added others of no less cogency, leading to the same conclusion. Among these are the errors, anachronisms, and contradictions, with which the book abounds, all of which may be explained by the probability that the work is an anonymous compilation drawn up in a later age, and possesses that degree of authenticity, which, neither invalidating nor confirming the truth of its contents, is of a secondary character only, as being, according to the admission of the author, derived from previous accounts.

Of the passages which are attended with these difficulties, those, in which the conversion of St Paul is variously related, will recur to our notice with other matters in our review of St Paul's life and epistles. The apparent confusion between the names Simeon, Simon, Cephas, and Peter will be treated of in a separate chapter relating to the Apostle Simon Peter: whilst the early use of the name Christians and the seeming anticipation of Christian worship, with other matters not limited to the Acts, will be treated separately hereafter. But whilst there is such an abundance of facts tending to establish the later origin of this book, and to prove that Luke the companion of St Paul, could not have been its author, the subject is too weighty to be hastily dismissed: nor would it be fair to omit many points which are common to the third Gospel and to the Acts of the Apostles. Whether some of these points may not, on more minute examination, be found to support rather than to upset our original proposition, must be answered according to the circumstances of each particular case.

An interesting coincidence of language and of custom occurs in the instructions given by our Lord, when he sent his twelve disciples out to preach, as we read them in the ninth chapter of the Gospel according to St Luke.

Whosoever shall not receive you, when ye go out of that city, shake off the very dust from your feet for a testimony against them (ix, 5).

To shake off the dust from one's feet is not the usual sign of expressing resentment or any other similar feeling, and yet it may be accepted as a very significant mark of displeasure; and we find it made use of by Paul and Barnabas,

when they left Antioch in Pisidia, and proceeded to Iconium. The account of this is found in the Acts of the Apostles as follows:

> The Jews stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts. But they shook off the dust of their feet against them, and came unto Iconium (xiii, 50-51).

Here we have the instructions of Jesus put into practice literally by those who, within a few years only, were engaged in teaching his doctrine; and if these two passages stood alone, it would be easy to infer a common origin of the two documents, in which this singular incident was named. But we find the same instructions, as given by Jesus, recorded in both the other Gospels, as they here follow.

Matthew, x, 14.	Mark, vi, 11.
And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet.	And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them.

Thus the conduct of Paul and Barnabas indicates no more reference to one gospel than to all the three, or to some custom that existed before the Gospels were written; it only shows that they practised an outward sign of the displeasure which they felt at the rejection of their doctrine, and we find that such outward sign was literally according to the instructions given formerly by our Lord, and probably recorded not only by tradition, but in many short memoranda made by the apostles and early disciples.

That there should have been "devout and honourable women" among the Jews cannot be considered doubtful; there are such among the Hindoos and other heathen nations: nor is it surprizing that they should give their aid to support the doctrines of their nation, even to the violent expulsion of new teachers who tried to introduce new doctrines. This fact has been too much overlooked by those who have taught such novel doctrines, forgetful that the truth is not so clear on subjects that are so far removed from human experience as to render the task of conversion other than extremely long and difficult. The conservative tendency of women may be traced, it seems, as far back as the

earliest years of Christianity, and is still an important factor in all the concerns and interests of mankind.

A second point of comparison between the Gospel of St Luke and the Acts of the Apostles arises from the sentiments which seem to have influenced our Lord, at all events in the beginning of his ministry and those which influenced the first disciples at Jerusalem, at all events in the beginning of their missionary enterprizes. In both the Gospel of St Luke and in the Acts the tidings of salvation were to be offered to the Jews and not to the Gentiles: but here again the exclusion of the Gentiles, by which name are designated all other nations, is even more pointedly expressed in St Matthew and St Mark than in the Gospel of which St Luke is asserted to have been the author. And here it is first necessary to point out the great confusion of ideas which has been caused by the introduction of the word Gentile into our authorized version of the Holy Scriptures; and of a similar nature is another term *heathen*, which, instead of representing an idea that prevailed when the original word was first written, now only represents an idea which had no existence in the early ages, but has since prevailed —many centuries nearer to our own times—and has led the reader away from what ought to be the harmless meaning, and conveys another meaning, offensive because universally applied to all others than Christians, or Jews, and perhaps Mahometans. With these words may be classed two other Greek names *Hellēnes* and *Hellēnistai*, which are used in the New Testament with little accuracy, and not tending to render clearer a subject which in its own nature is sufficiently obscure. It will then be desirable to examine more carefully these terms, as they occur in various passages not only of the Acts but of the entire Old and New Testaments.

CHAPTER III.

Greeks—Gentiles—Heathens—Nations.

The people who inhabit the great eastern peninsula of Europe, are first mentioned in the poems of Homer, where they appear to have been divided into an immense number of tribes, each bearing a separate name, and each occupying a limited territory round a town or city which often gave its name to the tribe and to the territory. In process of time the tribe of the Hellenes, or possibly the tribes, if there were originally more than one, prevailed over all the others, and by degrees their name Hellenes became extended over the whole nation, whilst Hellas became the name of the whole or the greater part of the peninsula.

But it is remarkable that the Romans never concurred in describing the Hellenes under this name. There was another tribe among the ancient inhabitants of the peninsula, named *Graioi*, and among the Romans this name was extended over the inhabitants of the whole country when it was annexed to the Roman empire. The small tribe, whose name thus became famous, existed in very ancient times, and its name occurs in the very earliest literature of Greece. Now the Greeks, as is well known, spread, at an early date, into all the maritime countries which border on the Mediterranean, and, as they generally migrated in large bodies to form colonies in the lands of those whom they called barbarians, the Greek language became the language of the towns which these emigrants constructed; but it must not be supposed that all the inhabitants of those maritime countries spoke the language of their invaders. Whilst in these towns Greek was generally spoken, in others, where the old inhabitants remained, the original dialects remained also, and by all the inhabitants of the rural districts the old language of the country undoubtedly was still spoken. The colonies of Greeks were but few in proportion to the natives, among whom Greek was not the native tongue, but only acquired as useful for carrying on trade or other intercourse with the Greeks, whether in Greece proper or in their own

several countries: Phœnicia, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, may be especially included in this statement. In Judæa proper the dominant, as well as the lower class, were genuine Jews, and only the imperial officials were Greeks or Romans, whilst of course a large number of the soldiers, who defended the country both from enemies without and from sedition and rebellion within, would be made up not only of Greeks and of Romans, but even partly perhaps of Jews and of all the other nations which composed the Roman empire.

The Greeks, until comparatively a late date, were almost unknown to the Jews, and we therefore find very slight notices of them or of their country Greece in the ancient Hebrew writings. It is from this cause that in the Old Testament we find only doubtful names, by which we may imagine the Greek nation to be meant, whilst in the New Testament, as well as in the Apocrypha, there are several passages, in which mention is made of the Hellenes, and there is no reason why this word should not be rendered Greeks, wherever it occurs in our authorized version of the Bible.

That little or no mention is made of the Greeks in the Old Testament is not surprizing: for it is doubtful whether the Jews were known by any other than the neighbouring tribes, when Alexander the Great conquered and destroyed the Persian empire. The story of the High Priest meeting the conqueror clad in his sacerdotal robes, and of the courteous liberality with which the victorious king treated the Jewish city, may or may not be accepted as a chapter of real history. Whether true or false, it is plain that the Jews were then a small people, connected neither by commerce nor by literature with any but their immediate neighbours. In their books, which I believe had at that time not been completed so as to form the Old Testament as we have it now, the writers were not likely to speak of nations, of which they knew but little. To identify the Greeks, or their country Greece, with any name found in any part of that book is a matter purely of conjecture, nor is it on any other ground that the Hebrew word, which may be represented in Roman characters by *Ivn* or *Iun*, is the equivalent of *Iōn* plural *Iōnes*, the Ionians, who inhabited a large tract of country in Asia Minor, and somehow or other may have come to the knowledge of the Jews, and been taken by them as forming, not merely one tribe out of many, but the whole Grecian nation.

This however is purely conjectural, as unfortunately are many other theories, that have been admitted as authentic into history, whether civil, military, or ecclesiastical, and especially the last. It will not be foreign to our purpose to examine the few passages in which this word *Iun* occurs.

1. In Genesis, x, 2, among other names, *Iun* is called the son of Japheth, and the name is translated Javan, according to the usual mode of interpreting Hebrew names by means of the vowel points.

2. In I Chronicles, i, 5, Iun is again named among the sons of Japheth, and is rendered Javan in our version as before.

3. In Isaiah, lxvi, 2, the word occurs as the name of a nation, and we read it as follows in the English Authorized Version:

And I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations, to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal, and Javan, to the isles afar off, that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles.

In verse 19 of the same chapter the name *Hellas* occurs as well as *ethnē* in the Septuagint, and has no counterpart in the Hebrew original or the English.

4. In Ezekiel, xxvii, 13-19, the name describes either places, or nations:

Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, they *were* thy merchants: they traded the persons of men and vessels of brass in thy market. . . . . Dan also and Javan, going to and fro occupied in thy fairs: bright iron, cassia, and calamus, were in thy market.

5. In Daniel the same word is, for the first time, applied expressly to Greece by our translators.

And the rough goat is the king of Grecia: and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. (viii, 21.)

6. Then said he, "Knowest thou wherefore I come unto thee? and now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth, lo, the prince of Grecia shall come. (x, 20.)

7. And now will I show thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings of Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all: and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia. (xi, 2.)

8. In Joel, iii, 6, it is applied to the Grecian people in our version.

The children also of Judah and the children of Jerusalem have ye sold unto the Grecians, that ye might remove them far from their border.

9. In Zechariah, ix, 13, the word is applied again to the country of Greece.

When I have bent Judah for me, filled the bow with Ephraim, and raised up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and made thee as the sword of a mighty man.

In the first and second of these extracts Javan, being evidently the name of a man, is retained as such in both the Septuagint and the Vulgate translations. In the other seven passages, taken out of the prophetical books, we find the Vulgate has *Græcia* or *Græci*, and the Septuagint *Hellenes* or *Hellas*, according as these two versions regard the original Hebrew word as designating the country or its inhabitants.

In the Apocryphal books of the Old Testament, which are found only in the Greek and Latin bibles, one passage from the First book of Maccabees (xii, 5) has *Spartiatais*, where our version inaccurately has *Lacedæmonians*, whilst in other passages (i, 10 : vi, 2) we find *Hellenes* of the Septuagint accurately rendered by *Græci* of the Vulgate. The same is the case with the passage of the Second book of Maccabees (iv, 10) where the same name occurs. It occurs also in a few other passages of the Apocryphal books, which do not require to be noticed, seeing that we have no Hebrew text wherewith to compare them.

These scanty notices of a people which for upwards of four hundred years were the leading nation in Europe, and even contested with the great Asiatic monarchies for the empire of the civilized world, indicate not only the seclusion which the Hebrew nation maintained, but also the smallness and indeed the comparative insignificance of the Hebrew territory and influence.

In the books of the New Testament the Hellenic race appears under very different circumstances, as regards their relation to the Jews. They are named, especially in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles, as forming a distinct and almost rival community, not only in Judæa, but in every other country, where Jewish settlers or Jewish

1003
BRITISH ISLES NAZARENE LIBRARY

merchants resided. They are mentioned once only in the Gospels, and fourteen times in the other books according to our English version; and the passages in which they are so mentioned are here subjoined.

1. And there were certain Greeks among them that came up to worship at the feast. (John, xii, 20.)

2. And it came to pass in Iconium that they [*Paul and Barnabas*] went both together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed. (Acts, xiv, 1.)

3. Then came he [*Paul*] to Derbe and Lystra: and, behold, a certain disciple was there, named Timotheus, the son of a certain woman, which was a Jewess and believed, but his father was a Greek; which was well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium. Him would Paul have to go forth with him; and took and circumcised him because of the Jews which were in those quarters: for they knew all that his father was a Greek. (Acts, xvi, 1-3.)

4. And some of them believed and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few. (Acts, xvii, 4.)

5. Therefore many of them believed; also of honourable women which were Greeks, and of men, not a few. (Acts, xvii, 12.)

6. And he reasoned in the synagogue every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks. (Acts, xviii, 4.)

7. Then all the Greeks took Sosthenes the chief ruler of the synagogue, and beat *him* before the judgement seat. And Gallio cared for none of those things. (Acts, xviii, 17.)

8. And this continued by the space of two years; so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks. (Acts, xix, 10.)

9. And this was known to all the Jews and Greeks also dwelling at Ephesus. (Acts, xix, 17.)

10. Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. (Acts, xx, 21.)

11. This is the man that teacheth all *men* everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place: and further brought Greeks also into the temple, and hath polluted this holy place. (Acts, xxi, 28.)

12. I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians; both to the wise, and to the unwise. So, as much as in me is, I

am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. (Rom. i, 14-16.)

13. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him. (Rom. x, 12.)

14. For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom: but we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. (I Cor. i, 22-24.)

15. But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised. (Gal. ii, 3.)

16. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. (Gal. iii, 28.)

17. Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond *nor* free: but Christ *is* all and in all. (Col. iii, 11.)

In all these extracts the English version well represents by Greeks the original Hellēnes of the Greek Testament; but the Latin Vulgate, dating from the time of Jerome or perhaps from even earlier times, already shows signs of that tendency to throw obscurity over ecclesiastical subjects, which has caused so much obstruction to the cause of historical truth even down to the present day. Of the seventeen passages given above, wherein the Greek nation is in the original language unmistakeably described by their proper national appellative, six only (2. 6. 12. 13. 14. 16.) in the Latin Vulgate render the term by Græci (i.e. Greeks) which is its proper Latin representative. In one of the others (7) the text of the original Greek is doubtful, and the Latin Vulgate omits the proper name *Greeks* altogether. In the other ten (1. 3. 4. 5. 8. 9. 10. 11. 15. 17.) the Greek *Hellenes* is rendered by *Gentiles*—which might include many other nations besides the Greeks, and is therefore a most improper word to be used in describing a nation which has its own especial and honoured name. That the term Gentile has been needlessly and improperly introduced into the Scriptures must be apparent, not only from its having thrown obscurity over the meaning of a national name that was plain and intelligible to all, but because it has been introduced into theological literature with a meaning wholly different

from that which it conveys in the Latin language out of which it is taken. The word *Gentiles* is invariably used by the Roman writers to describe those who belong to the same family and, more widely, to the same nation. "*Tuus gentilis, Brute, Marcus Pennius,* thy kinsman Marcus Pennius, O Brutus," writes Cicero (*Brut.* 28) and Livy says (iii, 58) that M. Claudius, when canvassing the people in Rome, appeared in the Forum in mean apparel "*cum gentilibus clientibusque* with his kinsmen and clients" to entreat their merciful consideration. But in the Scriptures and theological writings the name Gentiles is used to denote all other nations besides the Jews, and as if to support this meaning, there are many passages in which this word is used inaccurately to represent that of which it professes to be the translation.

In the authorized version of the Old Testament we find the word *Gentiles* in nearly thirty places, where the Greek Septuagint has *ethnē* and the Latin Vulgate *Gentes*. Each of these words accurately represents our English term *nation,* and either of them is a translation, the one into Greek and the other into Latin, of the Hebrew *guïm, goïm,* or *goyim,* according to the system of pronouncing Hebrew, which Hebrew scholars may choose to adopt. The word Gentiles is therefore a superfluous term introduced into our language rather to obscure than to express the meaning of the original name.

Now those passages of the Old Testament, in which the word Gentiles is found, need not detain us from the consideration of more important matters. If by Gentiles we understand no more than what is expressed by the English word *nations,* the Greek *ethnē* and the Latin *gentes,* from which indeed the term is derived, no evil consequences will flow beyond the generally dangerous practice of introducing a foreign technical term where our ordinary language supplies one that is generally understood and accepted. The thirty verses of the Old Testament furnish no information which would not equally be supplied if the word nations were substituted instead of Gentiles ; but there would then be less chance of misinterpreting the tendency of those accounts ; for the readers of our bibles are now likely to give an offensive signification to the people who are described under this technical offensive name. The sentiments entertained by the Jews towards all other nations speak less against those nations than against their own exclusive

system: and in many cases it will be found that those nations are not justly liable to be described under one degrading epithet.

The same term is applied a hundred times, more or less, in the New Testament, to the various nations which bordered on Judæa, or which through the agency of merchants, travellers, or settlers, were connected with the Jewish people. In this case also no advantage is derived from the use of a technical, where a common term would be sufficient. We do not however find that the word Gentiles represents in all the texts where it occurs, the same word either in the original Greek or in the Latin Vulgate.

It is not indeed necessary to examine the various passages in the Latin Vulgate where the word occurs: it is sufficient to observe that it is free from the inconsistent translation which occurs in our Authorized Version: it mostly translates *Hellēnes* by *Græci* and *ethnē* by *gentes* or *nationes*, and in two or three places by *Gentiles*, all of which have a meaning sufficiently identical to authorize the use of either in such cases. But in our English Version there are five places in which, apparently without any motive whatever, the word Gentile has been used, where Greeks would have been the correct translation. These passages are here given in full.

1. Then said the Jews among themselves, "Whither will he go, that we shall not find him? will he go unto the dispersed* among the Gentiles, and teach the Gentiles?" (JOHN, vii, 35.)

2. Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile. But glory, honour and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile. (ROMANS, ii, 9-10.)

3. What then are we better *than they?* No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin. (ROMANS, iii, 9.)

---

* The English translation of this passage cannot be maintained. The Greek original *tēn diasporan tōn Hellēnōn* must mean "the dispersal of the Greeks," not the dispersal of the Jews among the Greeks. In the Epistle of James (i, 1) we have "the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad" (*tais en tē diaspora*). The same word occurs in I Peter i, 1, *diasporas Pontou*, where there is no distinction of nationality. In II Macca. i, 27 *tēn diasporan hēmōn* "our dispersal" evidently means the dispersed Jews, establishing the fact that the genitive case of the name which follows the word *diasporan* denotes those who are dispersed, not those among whom the Jews were dispersed.

4. Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God. (I Cor. x, 32.)

5. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether *we be* Jews or Gentiles, whether *we be* bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. (I Cor. xii, 13.)

In all these extracts the translation is needlessly erroneous.

But there is another form of the Greek name, which has caused much difference of opinion among the interpreters of the New Testament. We find in various parts of that book the name *Hellēnistai*, of which not only is no interpretation given by any writer of the first two centuries, but the name itself occurs nowhere else than in the New Testament. Modern writers however have started various theories to explain this name, taking no thought of the very limited data which remain for giving it a sound interpretation. The only sound method would seem to be to gather its meaning from a comparison of the various passages in the New Testament where it occurs, and where it is always represented by the word *Grecians*. Now this word occurs in only one passage of the Old Testament, namely in the prophecy of Joel (iii, 6); and the name of the country, Greece, only in Zechariah (ix, 13). The Septuagint renders these words by the usual appellation *Hellas* for the country, and *Hellēnes* for its people. The name *Hellēnistai* nowhere occurs in that book, because the connection between the Jews and the Greeks was not yet so close as to have rendered such an intermediate name necessary, to describe a people that had certain relations both to the Jews and to the Greeks.

In the New Testament it occurs three times only: in two of which it represents the Greek word *Hellēnistai;* in the third passage some MSS read *Hellēnes*, others *Hellenistai.*

1. And in those days, when the number of the disciples was multiplied, there arose a murmuring of the Grecians [*Hellēnistōn*] against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration. (Acts, vi, 1.)

2. He [*Paul*] spake boldly in the name of the Lord Jesus, and disputed against the Grecians [*Hellēnistas*]; but they went about to slay him. (Acts, ix, 29.)

3. And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which,

when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus. (Acts, xi, 20.)

We may gather from these passages that the translators of the New Testament have endeavoured to distinguish the Hellenists from the Hellenes by using two English words, which bear to one another a certain relation, similar in form to that which the two Greek terms bear to one another. The name *Greek* is properly a noun substantive and means a man of Greece, whereas the word *Grecian* is an adjective signifying "of or belonging to Greece." But this latter term is often used as a noun substantive, to denote a man who studies or has knowledge of the Greek language, or is otherwise connected with Greece. In this sense it may be compared with *Hellēnistēs*, a man who studies or has knowledge of the Hellenic language—possibly also of Hellenic customs and other things. The verb *Hellēnizo* occurs in Thucydides (ii, 68), not indeed in its simple form, but in the passive voice *Hellēnisthēsan tēn glōssan* were made Greeks in language—said of a people who previously were barbarians.

From the scanty information thus afforded by the three sentences where the word occurs, we can only conjecture that Hellenic Jews are designated, who perhaps had dwelt in foreign countries, where they had learnt the Grecian manners and language, which would cause them to be marked as a separate class by the more exclusive people of Judæa, even when they came back to dwell in their native country. Admitting that this is mere conjecture, we may think it much more probable than that the name denotes Greeks, who had conformed to Hebraism, and we therefore cannot allow the word *Grecians* which occurs as a translation of the name in the Authorized Version, to be in any wise a well-chosen equivalent for *Hellenist.*

Whilst however there is great confusion in the use of these names, Greek, Gentile, and Hellenist, whereby also, as might be expected, great obscurity is thrown over the subject; there is another term which also has etymologically a very indefinite meaning, and which occurs more than a hundred times in our authorized version of the Bible. This word *heathen*, wherever it occurs, represents the same Hebrew word *goïm*, which we have already (p. 44) seen has grammatically the distinct meaning of "nations," thereby corresponding with *gentes* in Latin, and with the Greek

ethnē, of which it is the representative in every passage of the Old Testament where it occurs.

The etymology of this word is uncertain: it might seem indeed to have been at first nothing more than a corrupted sound of the Greek term, in which a simple transposition of the last two letters produces the English word deprived only of its initial aspirate. Nor is this derivation unsupported by other examples, which are indeed common in all languages. The English words *able, temple*, pronounced as if written *abel, tempel*, are derived from *habile, templum:* similarly the Greek *kardia* is otherwise spelt and pronounced *kradia:* and King Alfred's version of Orosius begins with the words *Ure yldran ealne thysne*, &c.: where *ure yldran* represents *our elders;* and in *ealne thysne* which our forefathers certainly pronounced *allen thissen*, and in numberless instances, occurring especially in Greek and English, the same transposition of the final letters has taken place. Nor does the etymology given by Dr Johnson from the German *heyden* furnish any objection to this derivation; for that word itself may have been similarly formed from the Greek; and it is well known that *th* and *d* were often interchanged, as indeed is shown in many MSS still in existence. Some etymologists, indeed, have proposed to derive this word from *heath*, supposing that those who in early times rejected Christianity may have been called by this name, from a habit of assembling on the wild heath to avoid the tyranny of their Christian persecutors. To support this derivation, they bring forward the word *pagan*, which denoted at first those who dwelt in villages *pagi* and were therefore farther from the ministry of Christian teachers, and retained their heathen worship longer than the inhabitants of the towns. But there is no likeness between the two cases: we have no mention of such secret assemblies of persistent heathens on the wild heath, nor is the heath so universal as to give its name to the wilderness in all countries alike; and if it were so, fugitives from oppression and tyranny would hardly draw upon themselves a name from places to which they retired to perform religious rites unknown to those, who wished to check those rites and to persecute those who practised them. For want of a better term we may consider this well known word heathen to have been derived at first from the Greek word *ethnē*, and perhaps to have borne a similar meaning when it was first used. Whatever may have been its origin, it now occupies an important place in our biblical and eccle-

siastical literature, but it has been mostly and unjustly made a term of reproach wherever it is used in our Bible, indicating the erroneous religion rather than the nationality of those to whom it is applied.

The word *heathen* is found in six passages only of the New Testament—(Mat. vi, 7—xviii, 17—II Cor. xi, 26—Gal. i, 16—ii, 9—iii, 8.) In the first two it represents the Greek adjective *ethnikos*, and in the others *ethnē;* but as the latter means the *nations*, and the former denotes a *man* belonging to one of those nations, there need be little or no difference in the terms by which those meanings are expressed in English.

Besides the three terms above-mentioned, a fourth and still more appropriate than either of these, *nations*, is found in several passages both of the Old and the New Testaments; and might with propriety have been substituted for *Gentiles* and for *Heathen*. There is no difference of meaning, where nations are spoken of, whether the Israelites are comprised under that general term or not. God said to Abraham (Gen. xvii, 6) "I will make nations of thee," and these nations were neither Gentiles nor Heathen, but Ishmaelites and Israelites, God's chosen people, described in the Greek and Latin translations by the same words *ethnē* and *gentes* (or *Gentiles*) which elsewhere are turned into names of reproach, not by those men who wrote the books, but by the growth of ideas, which up to the present time has brought us to designate opprobriously as *heathen* and *gentiles* some of the grandest *nations* of the earth.

CHAPTER IV.

Secular or Profane Authors.

The benevolent acts of our Lord during the period of his ministry, and the wonderful miracles performed by him, and after his death by his disciples, failed to enlist under his name the higher classes of the Jewish nation, before whose eyes most of those miracles had been performed. It was the more humble class of citizens who had generally witnessed and appreciated those miraculous powers, as indeed it was they who had derived both moral instruction and bodily healing from the teachers of the new religion. But it has not unreasonably been thought surprising that to the eminent Grecian and Roman philosophers, who at that very time were pursuing their researches into every department of science, the marvels which accompanied the introduction of Christianity seem to have been wholly unknown: and it is still more remarkable that, although the verbal report of miracles may have been ridiculed as untrue and therefore ignored, yet not only the names of the apostolic and other writers of the first century, but even the Christian books themselves, which contain doctrines quite as interesting as any propounded by the secular writers of that age, are conspicuously absent from the works of those secular writers, some of whom inhabited the very countries in which the Christian miracles were performed. The writings of the early Fathers, as they are termed, of the Church form a body of literature wholly distinct from the secular works of the same age, and it is seldom or never that we find in the latter any confirmation of the records which remain to us from the early Christian writers. And yet the first two centuries of our era are concurrent with the production of as large a mass of writings as any previous period of the same length had produced; and the nature of many of these writings is more similar to that of the Christian books than those which have come down from the preceding times of Grecian and Roman learning.

From the first dawn of literature, down to the beginning of the Christian era, a peculiar class of writings has pre-

vailed at one and the same time, and having run its course, has been succeeded by another, which has in its turn been followed by a third. First among Greek writers that remain to us come Homer and the other epic poets: to these succeed the lyric writers, Sappho, Alcæus, and many others. With them their peculiar style of poetry disappears for a time, and is replaced by the historians, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and later still Polybius, whilst pari passu with these we have the tragic and comic writers, Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, besides an hundred minor names, now almost forgotten: and lastly we have the orators, Demosthenes, Æschines, and others, who engrossed for a time all the attention of their contemporaries, and left little room for any one to attain to eminence by any other kind of composition.

It will be useful for our purpose to ascertain and review the number of Grecian and Roman writers who lived in the period of time since the crucifixion of Christ, down to the year of our Lord A.D. 180, in proof of the statement that the Christian books and their writers were not known to those Greeks and Romans at so early a date as it might be supposed they would be, if they were then in circulation, and if we consider the absorbing nature of their contents. It was shown in my former work, *Christian Records*, how far the profane writers had failed to take notice of the new religion which was then being preached throughout the Roman empire, and the conclusion to which the argument led, will apply to the Acts of the Apostles, to the Epistles, whether of St Paul, Peter, James, John, or Jude, and also to the Revelation, as well as to the deeds and discourses of Jesus recorded in the four gospels. But the present work would be incomplete if the same ground were not again gone over, in order to show how far the facts of the history subsequent to the Crucifixion are based upon authentic evidence, and how the writings in which those facts are recorded are to be understood, and when those writings were put into the shape which they now bear, as at present received into the Christian Canon.

In arranging the list of profane writers who lived and wrote between the years A.D. 30 and A.D. 160, I have consulted with advantage the Fasti Romani of Mr Fynes Clinton, whose profound and thorough knowledge of ancient chronology, especially in the early ages of Christianity, has gained for his work the highest credit as most trustworthy for all the conclusions at which he has arrived.

1. In the year A.D. 31, which was the 18th year of the emperor Tiberius, VALERIUS MAXIMUS was perhaps writing at Rome. His work on Memorable Sayings and Doings is certainly later, though probably not much later than the Augustan age; for in the last part of his work he mentions Sejanus, the corrupt minister of the emperor Tiberius. It is remarkable that the first of the nine books, into which his work is divided, treats principally of various religions and matters therewith connected.

2. The two Senecas, whose works, consisting of Epistles, Philosophical treatises, and Tragedies, are often printed together, lived at this time. The father, MARCUS ANNÆUS SENECA, died about the end of the reign of the emperor Tiberius.

3. His son, LUCIUS ANNÆUS SENECA, lived until the year 65, when he died, at the command of Nero, with his veins open in a vapour bath. It was in this year, according to Tertullian, that the apostles Peter and Paul also were put to death. One of the most audacious forgeries that ever were perpetrated may be seen in some letters that were published during the fifteenth century, in the early editions of Seneca's works, as having passed between that philosopher and St Paul.

4. PHÆDRUS, the fabulist, is thought to have lived about the middle of the first century: he is called a freedman of Augustus, and translated the fables of Æsop into Latin iambic verse.

5. ARETÆUS, the physician, whose medical treatise is extant, lived about A.D. 70.

6. PETRONIUS ARBITER, author of a curious satirical work in prose and verse, is supposed to have lived in the latter half of the first century.

7. JOSEPHUS, the Jewish historian, was present at the siege of Jerusalem, in the year A.D. 70, and will recur to our notice especially in connection with the early Christian disciple who bore the name of James, and with John the Baptist. PHILO the other Jewish historian died in the year 40,—too soon, seeing that he lived in Egypt, to have known anything of St Paul or any of the other apostles.

8. In A.D. 79 CAIUS PLINIUS SECUNDUS, the author of the Natural History, which occupies several volumes, perished at Pompeii in the eruption of Mount Vesuvius, being then 56 years of age. His work treats of all kinds of prodigies and wonders of nature, and it is remarkable that he took great interest in the wild beasts which were exhibited by Nero and other emperors, in the amphitheatre at Rome. The importance of this fact is obvious.

9. His nephew Caius Plinius Cæcilius Secundus, author of Letters and a Panegyrical Oration, was born in the year 61, nineteen years before his uncle's death, and lived to the time of Trajan (A.D. 98 to 117). He was brought by his office of governor into close relation with the Christians, to whom he behaved leniently—as he was permitted to be.

10. Silius Italicus, author of a long Latin poem on the Punic wars, was contemporary with the Plinies. He was born in A.D. 25, and was consul in 68, but the year of his death is uncertain.

11. Terentianus Maurus, author of a grammatical poem still extant, is ascribed to this period.

12. 13. The satirists Juvenal and Persius flourished under the empire from Tiberius to Domitian. The elder of these, Persius, was born in 34; Juvenal probably several years later, as he may be traced as late as the year 118.

14. Martial the Epigrammatist, according to the Fasti Romani, was born March 1 in the year 43, for he celebrated his 57th birthday, (that is, entered his 57th year) on the 1st of March, A.D. 99. He first came to Rome in the year 66. The celebrated Apollonius of Tyana came to Rome that same year.

15. Lucan, author of the Latin epic poem, Pharsalia, flourished about the year 60.

16. Probus is the name of several Roman grammarians. One of them, according to St Jerome, was "Probus Berytius eruditissimus grammaticorum."

17. Statius the Roman poet, author of the Thebaid, the Achilleid, and other poems, was a young man in the year 60 or 70. His father, a grammarian of the same name, died about A.D. 86.

18. Quintilian, the celebrated rhetorician, was born about the year 40, spent the greater part of his long life, like other literary men of that time, at Rome, and died at the advanced age of seventy-nine or eighty years.

19. Plutarch, the famous biographer and moralist, whose works fill twelve or more volumes, is known to us almost wholly by his works. Some of these (at least one relating to the Pythian priestess) were written about the year 80, soon after the eruption of Mount Vesuvius. Another of them was written in 106.

20. Suetonius, author of the lives of the twelve Cæsars, was a young man about the year 80.

21. Cornelius Tacitus, the famous historian of the Roman empire, was prætor in the year 80, and probably survived the emperor Trajan, who died in 117.

22. Epictetus, the Stoic philosopher, belongs to this age, but what we have of his moral discourses comes from the hand of Arrian, who heard his teaching and committed it to writing. Epictetus taught at Nicopolis in the time of the Dacian war, A.D. 103.

23. Ælian, author of *Varia Historia* and of *De animalium natura*, taught Rhetoric at Rome in the time of Hadrian (A.D. 118-137).

24. Arrian, who was born just before the end of the first century, and lived up to the latter half of the second, has left some considerable works besides his edition of the Discourses of Epictetus.

25. Artemidorus lived about the year 160, and has left a work on dreams entitled *Oneirocritica*.

26. Dioscorides was perhaps contemporary with Artemidorus, and has left a treatise *De materia medica*.

27. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, author of the well-known historical work which passes under his name, lived about the year 130 in the reign of Hadrian.

28. Galen, the most famous medical writer of antiquity, was born in the year 130.

29. Claudius Ptolemæus, the most famous astronomer and geographer of antiquity, is said to have made an observation of the sun in the year 189. He has left a large and most valuable work on geography.

30. Marcus Cornelius Fronto lived in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and was consul suffectus in 143. Fragments only of his works were known, until Angelo Mai found complete copies in the early part of the 19th century, and published them in two volumes: they have since been republished with corrections and additions.

31. Antoninus Liberalis, about the year 147, wrote a grammatical treatise in Greek, which is still extant.

32. Verrius Flaccus, author of another grammatical work, lived perhaps about the same time. A summary and extracts of his work exist under the name of Festus, who lived perhaps one or two hundred years later. Great uncertainty exists about the date at which all ancient writings were composed.

33. Appian was a native of Alexandria, but lived mostly at Rome, and after the death of Hadrian, which happened in 138, he wrote a general history of the Roman empire.

34. Hephæstion, the Greek grammarian, wrote about the year 160.

35. About the same time must have lived Aulus Gellius,

author of the interesting *Noctes Atticæ:* for he was a pupil of the notorious Peregrinus, who pretended to become a Christian a few years before this date, and was expelled from that community.

36. Lucian of Samosata, whose dialogues fill several volumes, lived and wrote about the year 160.

Contemporary with Lucian were Marcion, commonly called the heretic, and Justin Martyr: but of these the former has left nothing in writing, and is only here mentioned, because he occurs so frequently in the works of the Fathers, as one who is said to have caused heresy and schism to spring up in the early Church. And Justin Martyr, the earliest Christian writer of importance, will recur to our notice with others whose evidence may be used on the question concerning the origin and authorship of the Apostolical Epistles.

The date then, at which we have arrived in enumerating the profane writers, brings us to the time, when Christianity appears both on the stage of practical life, and also in various writings which have come down to the present day. But up to the latter part of the second century, no profane writer—and I have enumerated thirty-six who wrote up to that date—has taken the least notice of the books which form the canon of the New Testament, or mentioned the names of those to whom the authorship of those books is ascribed. Lucian indeed, or the author of certain dialogues which are included in the editions of his works, has in one of these dialogues given us an interesting description of the Christians as they existed in his time, and in another dialogue he has alluded to some religious teacher whom from the terms used we cannot avoid identifying with St Paul. With these exceptions we in vain look in any of the profane writers before mentioned for any indication, however slight, that the canon of the New Testament, including the Acts of the Apostles, had been compiled up to the middle of the Second Century after Christ, or that any of the books which form the canon, up to the same date, had any substantive or separate existence. The passages from Lucian will be quoted more appropriately hereafter, when we shall have to review the life and teaching of St Paul; but at present, it remains to examine the Ecclesiastical writers, who lived and wrote in the earliest age of Christianity, to whom, if the Apostolical writings, which are now included in our canon, had been in existence and current as having been written by the apostles, they must undoubtedly have been well known,

and by whom they would have been quoted in no doubtful language. It must however be borne in mind, that these observations are here made as applying more particularly to the epistles of St Paul, St James, Peter, John, and Jude: for the case of the Gospels has already been treated in my former work: and there is this difference between them and the epistles. The Gospels do not profess to have been written *by*, but *according to* Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John: but the epistles bear the names of apostles as their writers; and if contemporary authors had referred to them at all, the reference would be made not only to the epistles, but to those whose names occurred in the superscription, and whereas the reference to such names by contemporary writers would be a signal testimony to the authenticity of the epistles themselves, the absence of such reference furnishes equally strong evidence against the early existence of such documents. It is this negative evidence which an examination of so many Greek and Latin authors for nearly 200 years supplies.

It may be convenient to affix the dates at which the Roman emperors succeeded to the throne, as the chronology is very much guided by these dates:

A.D. 31 was the 18th year of the emperor TIBERIUS, and he reigned until the year 37.

37. Caius Cæsar, son of Agrippina, surnamed CALIGULA, succeeded Tiberius, and reigned from A.D. 37 until January, 41.

41. CLAUDIUS Cæsar reigned from January, A.D. 41 till September, A.D. 54.

54. NERO Claudius Cæsar, his stepson, succeeded and reigned till December, A.D. 68.

69. In the year 69 three emperors GALBA, OTHO, and VITELLIUS were successively elected emperors, dethroned, and put to death.

70. In the year 70 VESPASIAN ascended the imperial throne and reigned until June, A.D. 79.

79. His son TITUS reigned two years only, and died in September, A.D. 81.

81. DOMITIAN the brother of Titus reigned from A.D. 81 till 96, and was slain in September of that year.

96. NERVA, who was elected after Domitian, and reigned from A.D. 96 till A.D. 98, was murdered, as most of his predecessors had been before him.

98. Trajan his successor reigned from 98 to 117.

117. Hadrian occupied the throne from 117 to 138.

138. Titus Antoninus Pius from 138 to 161 and was succeeded by his adopted son.

161. Marcus Aurelius, who reigned till the year 180, when he died of disease in Pannonia, having, in continuation of the talents and labours of his more immediate predecessors, restored the credit of the Roman government from the state of anarchy and insubordination which had overspread the empire during the tyrannical and at the same time imbecile administration of Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and Domitian.

180. Commodus succeeds to the imperial throne and is put to death by a domestic conspiracy in the year 192.

CHAPTER V.

APOSTOLICAL FATHERS—1 BARNABAS, 2 CLEMENT, 3 HERMAS, 4 IGNATIUS, 5 POLYCARP, 6 AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS.

HAVING shown that in the first two centuries of the Christian era no profane writer has taken notice of the Epistles which are said to have been written by the Apostles, nor even mentioned the names of their authors, we are thrown back upon the first followers of the apostles and others for all the information which may be sought concerning those Epistles. And here we have a list of writings which have become famous through Christendom, not from their intrinsic excellence, for they are of the lowest possible value both in their literary and their moral character, and they abound with fables, only to be equalled by the tales of the imagination which amused the Western as well as the Eastern nations of the world.

Among the writers who are said to belong to the first century, those which have most occupied the attention of the world are the Apostolical Fathers, Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, besides the unknown writer of an Epistle addressed to an equally unknown Diognetus. All these are said to have been contemporary with the twelve apostles, and it is even asserted that some of their names occur in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles of St Paul. The questions which have arisen on this subject have been already discussed in my former work, to which the reader must be referred. It remains however to point out what testimony they furnish to support the genuineness and authenticity of the Epistles which enter into the canon of the New Testament; and this need not lead to any doubt respecting the doctrines, but only the form, and the language in which those doctrines have been handed down to the present day.

I. BARNABAS.

BARNABAS is the reputed author of a Catholic Epistle, and begins with a salutation: "Hail to you, my sons and daughters, in the name of the Lord, who loved us, in

Peace!" The whole tract consists of pious admonitions, which have no especial point, and are supported by abundant quotations in the words of the Greek Septuagint from the Old Testament, but the author does not mention any of the books which form the Christian canon, although he uses everywhere expressions which refer most probably to the Sayings (*logia*) of our Lord, and other Christian maxims which were current at that time. Nor does he name any of Christ's apostles, not even St Paul, although the Barnabas mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles is related as having been associated expressly with St Paul in his missionary travels, and is only once named in the New Testament save when connected by common duties with that apostle. This, it will be acknowledged, presents a difficulty in the way of our regarding the author of this epistle as the same with that Barnabas who plays so prominent a part in the early history of the Apostles.

It is not however to be denied that this epistle was written at a very early date, according to the last editor of the Apostolic Fathers as early as the very first year of the second century, but, as the destruction of Jerusalem which happened in the year 70, is plainly alluded to in the 15th section of the Epistle, and as Barnabas was then dead, the work before us must have had for its author another Barnabas and not the companion of St Paul. The same inference is due from the statement which the author makes in section 9, that all the Syrians were circumcised, whereas Josephus (*Antiq.* viii, x, 3) informs us that the Jews were the only Syrian nation which practised that rite. In the 15th section of his Epistle also the writer makes erroneous remarks about many points of the Hebrew law as coming from God. But Barnabas the companion of St Paul must have possessed too much knowledge to have made so many mistakes about these matters.*

The interval of time between A.D. 90 and A.D. 180 is full of forgeries and of works ascribed to the apostles, either intentionally for the purpose of deception, or unintentionally in many cases owing to the identity of name.

The Epistle of Barnabas was defective by the first four chapters, as far as the original Greek text is concerned, but has been made perfect by Tischendorf who in 1859 discovered a perfect Greek manuscript.

* See *Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*, F. X. Funk, editio post Hefelianam quartam quinta, page iv. Also further remarks on the Apostolical Fathers in my *Hebrew and Christian Records*, 2 vols 8vo, London, 1877.

II. Clement of Rome.

In the year 1633 Patrick Young published two epistles bearing the name of Clement bishop of Rome, supposed to be the same Clement whose name is mentioned by Saint Paul in his Epistle to the Philippians (iv, 3) as follows:

And I intreat thee also, true yoke-fellow, help those women which laboured with me in the gospel, with Clement also, and with other my fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life.

The Alexandrian MS, the only one, in which these two letters are found, contains one of the earliest texts known of the whole Greek Bible, namely the Old Testament with the Apocrypha, in the Greek Septuagint version and the New Testament nearly as we have it now. But besides the books which still are included in our Canon, the Alexandrian MS once contained not only these two Epistles of Clement, but also eighteen psalms of Solomon, which were evidently not genuine, and the use of which was forbidden by the Synod of Laodicea about the year 350 of the Christian era. These psalms are not now found in the manuscript, but are enumerated in the table of contents prefixed to the volume, of which they formed the conclusion when it was first written, but they now no longer are found in it. The table of contents consists of the names of the books which were once contained in the volume, and the last article is the eighteen psalms of Solomon, but betweeen them and the two epistles of Clement is the imperfect line,

OMOU BIBLIA . . . .

The dots mark the place where some numeral has probably been effaced, and Mr Cooper, in the Introduction to his edition of the Alexandrian New Testament, infers from the insertion of the line OMOU BIBLIA . . . which means "Altogether . . . books," that the canon is there supposed to end, and that the Psalms of Solomon, although included in the volume, were not inserted as part of the Canon; and the editor supposes, as just stated, that the letters denoting the number of books have by some accident been obliterated. It is difficult to deny the reasonableness of this conclusion, although it is a mere conjecture of the editor: but it is more to our purpose to remark that, by the same rule of criticism which excludes those spurious psalms of Solomon, both of the Epistles of Clement are included, which once were considered to be part of the Scriptural canon, when the Alexandrian MS was written. In the same way the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd

of Hermas are found in the Sinaitic MS of the Greek Bible, and doubtless were placed there as being part of the Canon generally received when that early MS was composed. These facts suggest a question why these are the only copies of the New Testament in which those doubtful writings are contained, among the many hundreds or even thousands which still exist in the various libraries of Europe, Asia, and perhaps of Africa also. This question must recur in judging of all such works as once were held in reverence as part of our Scriptures, but which in later times have, by the progressive law of decay, which possibly has not yet fulfilled its course, long been excluded from our books.

The two epistles of Clement have been printed in several editions since their first appearance, and have been the subject of controversy down to the present time: but the Second Epistle, as it is termed, has long been given up by all critics, as a fragment of a later homily, and need no longer occupy our attention. The two were translated into English by Archbishop Wake in 1693 and revised in 1833 by Chevallier, whose version is as accurate and useful for English readers as the style of the original will admit.

Of Clement's life we know absolutely nothing, and we have no proof of the identity of Clement named by St Paul with the writer of these two epistles, which have become known to us by only one copy written as some suppose in the 5th century of our era, and only first known to the world nearly twelve hundred years afterwards. It is true that Eusebius, who wrote in the early part of the fourth century, names Clement as third bishop of Rome, in four passages of his Ecclesiastical History, which are here given in full.

Linus, whom [Paul] mentions in the Second Epistle to Timothy as being with him at Rome, has already before been shown as having been allotted the episcopacy of the church of the Romans first after Peter. Clement also, who became too himself the third bishop of the church of the Romans, has testimony from him as having been his fellow-labourer and fellow-champion (Eus. iii, 4).

In the twelfth year of the same reign [*of Domitian*], Clement succeeds Anencletus, who was bishop twelve years of the church of the Romans. Him the apostle, when sending an epistle to the Philippians, names as having been his fellow-labourer, saying, "with Clement also, and with other my fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life" (iii, 15).

But of the bishops in Rome, in the third year of the above-named emperor [Trajan], Clement, having given up his ministry

to Evarestus, ends his life, having presided in all nine years over the ministry of the divine word [iii, 34].

But it must be known that there is said to be a second epistle of Clement: we do not however know that this also is yet equally known with the former, because we neither know that the ancients also made use of it. But moreover some have of late brought forward other writings also very verbose and long as of the same author, containing indeed Dialogues of Peter and Apion, of which no mention at all is current among the ancients. For neither do they preserve the pure mark of apostolical orthodoxy [iii, 38].

In these extracts it appears that Clement the companion of St Paul was the third bishop of Rome, and that not Paul, as might have been expected from the Acts of the Apostles, but Peter, who is nowhere for two hundred years named as having ever been at Rome, was the first who obtained that pre-eminence. It appears in the second place that to Clement was ascribed a second epistle, which Eusebius does not deem to be genuine, and that many other works of great length and very verbose were brought forth at a date *echthes kai prōēn*, "yesterday and the day before," under the name of Clement, but that these were treated with scant courtesy by the generally credulous Eusebius. We need not doubt that these works, besides the Dialogues of Peter and Apion, were the Recognitions, the Clementine Homilies, the Apostolical Constitutions, Decretals, and also two other Epistles addressed to Virgins, all of which are only of use as documents delivered down to us from a very early age, but having no pretension whatever to be considered as the writings of Clement, the companion of St Paul. Confining ourselves therefore to the First Epistle which passes under his name, we may observe that the writer, whoever he may be, mentions not only St Paul but also perhaps St Peter, and he speaks at some length of the First Epistle which the former of those apostles wrote to the Corinthians, to whom he also is writing. The passages, in which these notices occur, shall be placed before the reader.

Let us take before our eyes the holy apostles. . . . . .*

* There is a blank here in the MS. The editors and translators have not hesitated to supply the name Peter—perhaps correctly, but it is right to state that it is only by conjecture that they have done so. The words (banished *or* scourged) also occupy a place where two or three letters only are left, which may belong to either of the Greek words represented by banished or scourged.

through unjust envy underwent not one nor two but several labours, and so bearing witness he went to the place of glory that was his due. Through envy Paul received the reward of endurance, having seven times borne chains, [banished *or* scourged], stoned, having been a preacher in the east and in the west, he received the noble glory of his faith. Having taught the whole world righteousness, and gone to the bounds of the west, and borne witness before rulers, he thus departed from the world and went to his holy place, becoming the greatest pattern of endurance [c. 5].

Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle. What has he written to you first in the beginning * of the gospel? Of a truth he wrote to you spiritually about both himself and Cephas and Apollos, because that you then also had made for yourselves partialities. But that partiality brought less sin on you: for your partiality was to the apostles who had been proved, and to a man who was approved among them [c. 47].

These quotations however must not be supposed to represent well ascertained facts: for whereas Eusebius says Clement was the third bishop of Rome after Peter, Jerome, who wrote about 30 or 40 years after Eusebius, shows that the order of bishops, as they have by anticipation of that dignified office been termed, was not so thoroughly ascertained even among the ancients. Jerome's account is as follows:—

Clement, of whom the Apostle Paul speaks in his Epistle to the Philippians, was the *fourth bishop of Rome after Peter;* since Linus was the second and Anacletus the third, although several of the Latins think that Clement was the second after the apostle Peter [*Catalogus Scripp.* c. 15].

Tertullian also (*Præsc. Hæret.* 32) tells us that Clement was said in the Roman church to have been ordained, not by St Paul whom he is generally supposed to have accompanied, but by St Peter, with whom he is nowhere else said to have been thrown into connection, until we come to the Clementine writings of a later date. Before we draw any inference from these conflicting statements, it is desirable to know whether earlier writers than Eusebius have borne such testimony as may prove that the Epistle of Clement, which we now have, is the work of him who was the com-

* I have no doubt that this means the first days of the Gospel dispensation, not in the first pages of any book so called.

panion and disciple of St Paul. And here we have similar difficulties to contend with; for the first writers who seem to assert the identity of the two are Irenæus and Origen at the beginning of the third century. The testimony of the latter is somewhat vague, and that of the former comes to us through the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius who wrote at the beginning of the fourth century. The same historian also quotes Dionysius of Corinth and Hegesippus as naming Clement and his epistle; but he quotes from these two writers nothing to show that they identified him with the Clement named in St Paul's epistles. Hegesippus and Dionysius wrote as late as the year A.D. 160; when most of those forgeries and false ascriptions of writings were already beginning to swarm throughout Christendom. The first-named writer Irenæus is said to have written in Greek a work "Against Heresies," but nothing of it remains except fragments preserved by Epiphanius and Eusebius. There is a Latin work under the same title which purports to be a translation of the original Greek, and is supposed from the debased style to have been written as late as the fourth century.

If then these are the only grounds upon which we claim the epistle to the Corinthians to be the production of one who is named in the New Testament as a cotemporary and companion of St Paul, such a claim indicates a facility of belief which is not generally shown in the case of any secular writing of which we have any knowledge. There are however certain passages in the epistle which are utterly unworthy of an apostolic writer, as for instance the Fable of the Phœnix, which we can hardly believe to have been written whilst St Paul was still preaching Christianity, or by one who succeeded to his ministry.

Let us consider a strange miracle which takes place in the regions of the East, that is in Arabia. For there is a bird called the Phœnix. This being the only-begotten [of its parents] lives 500 years, and when it arrives at its dissolution by death, it makes for itself a coffin out of frankincense and myrrh and the rest aromatics, into which, when its time is fulfilled, it enters and dies. From its flesh when rotten a worm is born, which is nourished from the moisture of the dead animal and generates wings. Afterwards when it becomes strong, it takes up that coffin, where the bones of its predecessor are, and carrying these completes the journey from the country of Arabia to Egypt into the city called Heliopolis [city of the Sun] and in the day-time, in the sight of all men, flying over the altar of the sun, it places

them there, and so departs back again. Do we think then it is a great and marvellous thing if the Creator of all things shall bring about the resurrection of those who have served him righteously in the confidence of a good faith, when he shows to us even by a bird the greatness of his promise. (*Ep. Cor.* 25-26.)

And it is important to ask why Clement, whose name indicates his nationality, should have written letters in Greek to the Corinthians, who were a Latin colony. It is safer to infer that the Christian system owed its first propagation, not to the Jews, but to Greeks or Grecizing Romans, who consequently have handed down to us in Greek the various gospels, acts, epistles, revelations, and other writings, with which the world already abounded in the middle of the second century.

III. Hermas.

The third of the Apostolical Fathers is Hermas, whose work, the *Shepherd*, is found with the Epistle of Barnabas in the Sinaitic MS, a very ancient one, of the Greek Bible. We have hitherto had only a Latin text of this work, which was universally and reasonably supposed to have been derived from a Greek original. There were indeed some fragments of the Greek remaining, and the whole work in that language has since been discovered: but the whole subject of these five Fathers has been treated in so many books and by so many critics that little remains to be said about any of them. The work before us is a kind of Apocalypse, dealing in visions and moral teaching. It once was highly esteemed and, if not as part of the canon, was copied into the same volume with the canonical books, and deemed little or not at all inferior to them. No one believes its author to have been the Hermas named in St Paul's Epistle to the Romans (xiv, 14), and as it does not name St Paul or any of the Apostles, or quote from their writings, we need devote no more time to the consideration of a work so insignificant.

IV. Ignatius.

Ignatius, as we learn from Eusebius (iii, 22), succeeded Evodius as bishop of the church of Antioch. It is said that when he was about eighty years old, he was condemned to be sent to Rome and cast to the lions because he was a Christian. We are surprised at being told that this sentence was passed on him by the benevolent Trajan, whilst stopping at Antioch in his march against the Parthians. On

the journey from Antioch to Rome, it is said that during his stay at Smyrna he conversed with Polycarp, bishop of that city, and wrote from thence four letters, to the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallians, and the Romans. A similar stoppage was made in the Troad, where he is said to have written three other epistles, to the Philadelphians, the Smyrnæans, and to Polycarp, whom he had left at Smyrna. On his arrival at Rome, he was cast to the lions, and his bones, gathered from the area of the amphitheatre, were carried back to Antioch, and preserved with great care by the Christians of that city. These facts and others are found in the Acts of his Martyrdom, and have been treated by many writers as wholly inconsistent with antecedent probability, and internally with themselves. The "Acts of his Martyrdom" deals with matter such as is found in the Acta Sanctorum of the Middle Ages, and is similar in style and thought to that legendary mass of fable and history intermixed. Having treated fully on the subject of Ignatius in my former work, I have only to declare my own opinion that his letters are neither genuine nor authentic; and to add the more cautious opinions of several eminent writers who would, if they had lived in the present age of freedom, and of facts lately brought to light, have probably come to the same opinion as myself.

I. Owen (John): *Enquiry into the Nature, &c., of Evangelical Churches.* London, 4to, 1681.

If any of his [Ignatius's] writings do yet remain, yet the corruption and interpolation of them for many ages must needs much impair the authority of what is represented in them as his; nor am I delivered from these thoughts by the late, either more sound or more maimed, editions of them; and the truth is, the corruption and fiction of epistolical writings in the first ages was so intolerable, as that very little in that kind is preserved sincere and unquestionable.

II. Spanheim (Frid.): *Summa Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ.* Lug. B. 12mo, 1689.

Ejus epistolæ septem in vinculis scriptæ, &c. . . . . omnium purgatissimæ . . . Sed nec leves sunt Salmasii, Blondelli, Dallæi, Laroquii dubitandi de prioribus rationes: quum sint in iis plurima, quæ Ignatio posteriora videantur, phraseologiæ,

His seven epistles, written in bonds, &c. . . . . are the most pure of all. . . . But by no means trivial are the reasons which have led Saumaise, Blondel, Daillé, and Laroche to doubt about [these] former ones: seeing that there are in them

facta, hæreses, ritus, disciplinæ ratio.

many things which seem later than Ignatius, phraseologies, facts, heresies, rites, and systems of discipline.

III. Ittig (L. T.): *Bibliotheca Patrum Apostolicorum.* 12mo. 1699.

Asserere haud ausim, quod... Ignatii epistolæ per tot secula ab omni interpolatione liberæ ad nostram usque ætatem permanserint [p. 287].

I would not dare to assert that the epistles of Ignatius have remained through so many centuries free from all interpolation down to our times.

IV. Basnage (Sam.): *Annales Politico-ecclesiastici.* Roter, 3 vols, fol. 1706.

Patribus, qui secundo floruere seculo, ignotæ fuerunt Ignatianæ epistolæ—ignotæ Justino, Theophilo Antiocheno, Irenæo, Clementi Alexandrino, Tertulliano, qui nunquam eas adhibent refellendis hæreticis, licet apocryphis libris sæpenumero utantur [ii, p. 20].

The epistles of Ignatius were unknown to the Fathers, who flourished in the second century—unknown to Justin, to Theophilus of Antioch, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, who never make use of them for refuting heretics, although they often make use of the apocryphal books.

V. Oudin (Casim.): *Commentarius de Scripp. eccles. antiqq.* Frankofurti, 3 vols, fol. 1722.

Dicimus itaque post Dallæum epistolas septem Ignatii nomine editas, tam Græce quam Latine, esse Antiocheno huic episcopo supposita [p. 88].

We say therefore after Daillé that the seven epistles published under the name of Ignatius, as well in Greek as in Latin, are falsely ascribed to this bishop of Antioch.

VI. Beausobre (Isaac de): *Histoire crit. de Manichée, &c.* Amster. 4to, 1734.

L'opinion, qui me paroit la plus raisonnable est que les plus pures ont été interpolées [vol. i, p. 378, not. 3].

The opinion which appears to me the most reasonable is, that the most pure of them have been interpolated.

VII. Lardner (Nathaniel): *Works.* London, 8vo, 1788.

Whether the smaller [epistles] themselves are the genuine writings of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, is a question that has been much disputed, and has employed the pens of the ablest critics: and whatever positiveness some may have shown on

either side, I must own I have found it a very difficult question [vol. ii, p. 68].

VIII. Heumann (Chr. Aug.): *Conspectus Reipublicæ Litterariæ*, edit. 7, 12mo, Hanov. 1763.

Ad Pseudo-Ignatium quod attinet, est sane quod mirer, esse adhuc eruditissimos viros, qui sputa ejus lingant nec agnoscant fraudem tot manifestis probatam indiciis [p. 492].

As regards the false Ignatius there is good ground for my wondering that there are so many very learned men who lick up his spittle, and do not recognize a fraud which is betrayed by so many clear proofs.

IX. Jortin (John): *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, Lond. 8vo. 1751.

Though the shorter epistles are on many accounts preferable to the larger, yet I will not affirm that they have undergone no alteration at all [vol. i, p. 361].

X. Mosheim (J. L.): *Ecclesiastical History, translated by Maclaine*, 2 vols, 4to, London, 1765.

I cannot help looking upon the authenticity of the Epistle to Polycarp as extremely dubious, on account of the difference of style; and indeed the whole question relating to the epistles of Saint Ignatius in general seems to me to labour under much obscurity, and to be embarrassed with many difficulties [vol. i, p. 51].

XI. Rosenmüller (D. J. G.): *Historia interpretationis librorum sacrorum in Ecclesia Christiana.* Hildburg, 5 vols, 12mo, 1795.

Ad epistolas Ignatii quod attinet, totam earum causam valde impeditam esse omnes hodie fatentur. Quicquid sit de earum auctore, atque de tempore quo scriptæ sunt, hoc saltem certum est et indubitatum, tantam esse Ignatianarum Epistolarum et Pseudo-Clementinarum Constitutionum quæ apostolicæ nominantur cognationem et similitudinem, ut dubitari vix possit quin alteruter scriptor alterius dogmata atque præcepta expresserit [vol. i, p. 116].

As regards the epistles of Ignatius, all now acknowledge that the whole question about them is very intricate. However it may be about their author and the time when they were written, this at least is certain and undoubted that so great is the connection and likeness of the Ignatian epistles and of the Pseudo-Clementine Constitutions which are called Apostolic, that it can scarcely be doubted but that the one writer has copied the dogmas and the precepts of the other.

XII. The editor of *Corpus Ignatianum*, a collection of all the Epistles ascribed to Ignatius, Dr Cureton, in his supplementary volume, Vindiciæ Ignatianæ, Lond. 8vo, 1846, makes this important remark concerning the writers of the first three centuries as authorities for the authenticity of Ignatius.

> There are three citations during this period: one by Irenæus in the second century, and two by Origen in the third, and these are the only evidence we have of the existence of any writings of St Ignatius for a period of more than two hundred years [p. 54].

With these opinions from some of the most eminent critics, it is unsafe to regard the Epistles of Ignatius as relics of the earliest Christianity. Nor is it needful to deny that such a man as Ignatius ever existed or that he was dignified with the title of bishop in the city of Antioch at an early date. The doubt is confined within narrow limits. There were current in the second and third centuries many writings which were, on very scanty grounds and sometimes perhaps on none at all, attributed to names that had been handed down by tradition from the first teaching of Christianity, and it is safe to infer, without affixing to any one the charge of forgery, that the epistles of Ignatius owe their preservation to such a supposed origin.

The tract called the Martyrdom of Ignatius is, as already mentioned, similar to the later legends of Saints, and as it informs us that Ignatius was sentenced to death by Trajan at Antioch in a year when that emperor was not at Antioch, and also was allowed, during his unreasonably long journey to Rome, to write letters advocating the very Christian doctrines for which he was condemned, sent to Rome, and suffered, we may set aside the legend as wholly unworthy to be classed among historical traditions.

V. Polycarp.

Polycarp is said by Eusebius (iii, 36) to have been bishop of Smyrna, to which Tertullian adds, in his work on the Proscription of Heretics (32), that he was successor in that see to St John the apostle. Irenæus is the first writer who names Polycarp, and what he says about him comes to us mostly through the quotations found in Eusebius. He is said to have gone to Rome, where he had a controversy with Pope Anicetus concerning the celebration of Easter. As might be expected, neither surrendered his opinion to the other, and they parted good friends, both being orthodox

according to received opinions, although divergent on points of detail. Polycarp however did not show the same forbearance towards heretics: for Eusebius informs us that when Marcion came into the presence of Polycarp, and requested to be acknowledged by him, he was met with the reply "I acknowledge thee as the first-born of Satan." In this reply, however harsh, he might have cited the example of St John the apostle, who going into a bath at Ephesus and seeing Cerinthus another heretic, immediately withdrew, saying, "Lest the presence of such an enemy of the truth should cause the bath to fall upon their heads." These stories also come to us through the medium of Eusebius (iv, 14, iii, 38) and are probably and—I may add—for the credit of Christianity, as likely to be untrue, as other legends of that obscure age.

The epistle of Polycarp contains the following passages in which St Paul is named.

For neither I nor any other like me is able to attain to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who being amongst you, taught accurately and firmly the word of truth before the face of the men of that time: who also when absent wrote to you epistles, which if you look closely into, you will be able to be built up into the faith that has been given to you [*Ep. ad Philip.* 3].

I therefore exhort all of you to be obedient to the word of righteousness and to cultivate all patience, which you have also seen with your very eyes, not only in the blessed Ignatius, and Sosimus, and Rufus, but also in others of you, and in Paul himself and the other apostles (8).

The third extract from Polycarp's epistle does not appear in the Greek, but in one of the five chapters which are found in Latin only at the end of the epistle.

Do we not know that the saints shall rule the world, as Paul teaches? But I have neither perceived nor heard any such thing among you, among whom Saint Paul laboured, and who are [praised] in the beginning of his epistle [11].

VI. Epistle to Diognetus.

To the preceding five writers has of late been added the Author of an Epistle addressed to Diognetus. It is worthy of notice that the writer uses the same epithet, which is prefixed to Theophilus in the Gospel according to St Luke and in the Acts of the Apostles. He addresses him as "Most Excellent Diognetus" *kratiste Diognētos,* and it may be added that the same epithet is applied to the emperor

Tiberius in the Report [*Anafora*] sent by Pontius Pilate of the events relating to the crucifixion of Jesus which had taken place whilst he was governor of Judæa. In that spurious document the inscription is *kratistō sebastō* "To the most Excellent Augustus:" and no doubt there are other documents in which the same epithet may be found. But we know nothing of him who wrote the Epistle to Diognetus, and the only manuscript copy of it which has come down to modern times has long ago disappeared. The opinions of critics vary as to its age, varying indeed from the earliest days of Christianity to the first years of the third century. It is my own opinion that it is due to the same period of the second century which produced so many writings more or less genuine, constituting what the Christians of that day would find useful for the preservation both of Christian history and of Christian doctrine. There is one passage in this work which cannot be passed over: it occurs in the 12th chapter of the work.

In this place was planted a tree of knowledge and a tree of life: but it is not the tree of knowledge which slayeth, but disobedience. . . . . Neither life without knowledge nor knowledge without a true life is safe, wherefore each was planted near [the other]. The apostle seeing this power and blaming the knowledge which is practised without the truth [reality] of the commandment, to life, says "Knowledge puffeth up, but Love edifieth."

These words occur in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (viii, 1), but the writer does not name St Paul, and thus the same unfortunate doubt remains, how far Christian maxims and proverbs which are found in the New Testament owe their origin to the first disciples of Jesus, or were current among the Christians, and therefore quoted at a later date by those who compiled the Christian books.

This however is not the only comment that may be made on the extract before us. It is the opinion of nearly all the critics that the 11th and 12th chapters of the Epistle to Diognetus are later additions; the scope of the writer seems to have been completed at the end of chapter 10, and in the original MS there was a break of continuity, indicating the probability that what followed was wholly alien, written only, as we find in many ancient manuscripts, without other motive than to preserve the sentiments or expressions therein contained, but with no thought of adding it as a portion of the preceding work.

CHAPTER VI.

The Canon of Muratori.

The short fragment, which passes under this name, is so called from Muratori, the learned Italian scholar, who found it, about the year 1740, in the Ambrosian library at Milan. The manuscript in which it occurs, was thought by Muratori to be as early as the eighth century of our era, but although the vellum on which it was written, and the ink with which it was written, may be of that date, it is possible that this particular manuscript was copied from an earlier one, the date of which cannot be ascertained. Whilst some critics, therefore, refer the subject-matter and the original document to the third or even to the second century, it is evident that this opinion is conjectural unless supported by evidence. Muratori published the fragment in his *Antiquitates Italicæ Medii ævi*, iii, page 851; and it has since been frequently published, especially in England, at Oxford, in 1867, by Dr Tregelles, and since by Dr Westcott in his work on the Canon of the New Testament.

It appears from the statement of those who have seen the manuscript in the Italian library, where it is preserved, that the canon occupies only one leaf and nearly half of another, or three pages only. The first nine leaves are filled with an extract from a work of Eucherius, ending abruptly at the bottom of folio 9*b*, which according to our modern system of pagination would be page 18. The fragment of the canon then begins with the last words of a sentence *quibus tamen interfuit*, showing that some intervening leaves had been removed. What remains of the canon is apparently the whole that ever was copied in this particular manuscript, except what is lost at the beginning. For on folio 11*a*, which would be page 21 according to our system, the canon ends with the words *una cum Basilide assianum Cataphrygum constitutorem*.

It will not be necessary at present to cite more of this document than the few lines which relate to the Acts of the Apostles. They form a specimen of the whole, and are as follows, printed with all the peculiarities that belong to

the original, and line for line as they occur in that document.

. . . . . acta autē omniū apostolorum
sub uno libro scribta sunt lucas obtime theofi
le conprindit quia sub praesentia ejus singula
gerebantur sicute et semote passionē petri
euidenter declarat sed profectionē pauli ad ur
bes ad Spania proficiscentis.

It is not difficult to see the general drift of this passage, in which the only point that concerns us at present is that the writer, whoever he was, ascribes the authorship of the Acts to the evangelist St Luke. He also names Theophilus to whom the Acts in our New Testament is dedicated. It would appear also that St Luke has related in that book the Acts of all the Apostles, which is not true, and it is also erroneously stated that St Luke has written events which passed in his own presence. But the latter part of the extract is obscure; the passion, i.e. the martyrdom, of St Peter is mentioned, and also the departure of St Paul from Rome on his way to Spain, but whether St Luke is named as having written about the passion of St Peter separately, i.e. in a separate work, which *semote* undoubtedly may mean, or whether *semota passione* (a suggested correction) means that St Luke had intentionally excluded the martyrdom of Peter, because he had not himself witnessed it, we may hesitate to determine—only, if St Luke was at Rome with St Paul, he was much more likely to witness the death of Peter, whereas it is almost certain that he did not witness half of the events related in the Acts of the Apostles. The last clause of the extract is so corrupt that it is impossible to say how the writer meant to describe the departure of Paul for Spain: for there is no verb in the sentence, but *ab urbes* may reasonably be corrected to *ab urbe*, for we know that if St Paul went to Spain at all it is more than probable that he set out from the city of Rome.

As this fragment has been much quoted in support of the Canon of the New Testament, it cannot be dismissed without further notice. Its authenticity has been defended by Dr Westcott and others, apparently on incomplete and unsatisfactory evidence: for it is possible that the original document was written not much earlier than the eighth century, the date of the only manuscript in which it now is found. In that MS volume, as already mentioned, the fragment is preceded by a work of Eucherius, a bishop who lived in the latter half of the fourth century, and further on

in the same volume occur passages from Ambrose, bishop of Milan, who was contemporary with Eucherius. It might then be thought needless to dwell on an anonymous production of so late a date, for the purpose of investigating the age and authenticity of the Apostolical Records.

But it is not desirable that weight should be attached to evidence which is weak and worthless for determining such an issue. The Canon of Muratori is cited in proof that the New Testament existed, almost as we have it now, in the latter part of the second century. Few critics hesitate to admit this without a doubt. But the Canon of Muratori is insufficient, if standing alone, to prove even this: for there are certain points in it to be remarked, which seem to indicate that it furnishes no evidence at all on the subject, beyond the fact that our New Testament existed in the eighth century, and possibly earlier up to the fourth century of our era, or even higher still. In the first place the fragment is written in Latin, and we have no other Christian writings remaining from the middle or end of the second century, in any other language than the Greek. But there are two words in the fragment which are of the utmost importance: the author speaks of St Paul's setting out to Spain, "profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis." The expression "*ab urbe* [says Dr Tregelles] indicates the Roman character of the document;" and this, whilst it brings down the age of the writer to a later date, renders his testimony less valuable for all the transactions of the earliest period of Christianity.

Another objection to the use of this fragment may fairly be made from the tendency of the writer to record improbable legends such as that which will hereafter be related in connection with the life and epistles of St John, when we come to speak of that apostle.

But it is fair to say that there is one expression in this document which assigns, with some latitude it is true, a date, at which the orginal manuscript may have been written. In connection with Pope Pius it is stated that his brother Hermas wrote the Shepherd *temporibus nostris*, "in our times," that is, "in the times of the writer," but as Pius was bishop of Rome until the year 157, it is equally certain that *temporibus nostris* may designate a later time, perhaps 40 years, than that pontificate, and so no testimony is rendered in favour of contemporary authorship by this assignment of a date.

It has been well remarked by Dr Donaldson, that the

Canon may be referred to a much later date even than the end of the second century; for that the expression, which represents Pius as sitting in the episcopal chair at Rome, was never used until more than two hundred years had elapsed after the beginning of the Christian era, and this would destroy the credit of its author. The same writer, referring to the theory of its being a translation from the Greek, as some commentators have suggested, as well as to its mutilated state and to the barbarous and ungrammatical style which it displays, has the following remarks:

If it is thus mutilated, why might it not also be interpolated? If moreover the translator was so ignorant of Latin, can we trust his translation? And what guarantee have we that he has not paraphrased and expanded the original? The force of these remarks is peculiarly felt in dealing with the paragraph which gives the date. The Pastor of Hermas was not well known to the Western Church, and it was not highly esteemed. It was regarded as inspired by the Eastern, and read in the Eastern Churches. We have seen, moreover, that it was extremely unlikely that Hermas was a real personage. It would be therefore far more probable that we have here an interpolation or addition by a member of the Roman or African Church, probably by the translator, made expressly for the purpose of serving as proof that the Pastor of Hermas was not inspired. (*Hist. of Christian Liter.* &c. iii, 209.)

It is hopeless to discover the writer of this Canon, and it would be a subject of much wonder that the Chevalier Bunsen, in his Hippolytus (i, 314), should have ascribed it to Hegesippus, Muratori to Caius, a Roman presbyter, and others to Papias, although it is notorious that all the fragments which remain of these lost writers might be printed on a dozen octavo pages. But the minute investigations of critics are often carried to unreasonable lengths. It is seldom that the authorship of an anonymous work can be discovered on decisive evidence; and in such cases all conclusions are conjectural. Nor is it important that we should know who wrote the document which we are now considering. It contains a list of books almost identical with those which we have in our Bibles, but it adds several others which are wholly apocryphal. This very much lessens its claim to be produced at all in evidence as to the authorship or authenticity of those which are still retained in our canon.

CHAPTER VII.

Minor Writings of the Second Century.

In the list of early Christian writers, the Apostolical Fathers are followed by the Apologists, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theophilus, and Aristagoras, to whom are ascribed certain treatises written in defence of the new religion, and still preserved in various manuscripts, although not all equally genuine or authentic. Concurrently with these there still remain a few short epistles, and fragments of writings preserved as quotations in later Christian writers, the works from which they are quoted having for many centuries disappeared, or at all events never yet having been discovered in any of the numerous libraries of ancient manuscripts.

Of all these writers Justin Martyr is the principal, and his apologies addressed to the Roman emperor, although indicative of the same low level of intellect and of the same superstition which characterizes all the early Christian writers, is for historical purposes by far the most important.

But the writings of Justin Martyr have been too often reviewed, especially in my former work, Christian Records, to make it needful now to invite the reader's attention to the subject. Justin Martyr has nowhere quoted any of the epistles contained in our New Testament, nor has he named Paul, James, John, or Jude, as we have also previously seen that he has not named any of the four evangelists in any of the works which pass as genuine bearing his name. The single passage, in which he says that "Jesus changed the name of one of his disciples to Peter, and called two others of them Boanerges, that is Sons of Thunder," has no reference to any writings, but simply indicates that those changes of name were, in Justin's time, recognized as facts which had taken place during the ministry of Jesus upon earth. The date of Justin Martyr cannot be earlier than A.D. 150, and may perhaps be later. It is not to be thought that the epistles which are now current as part of the canon, were then publicly recognized: for if they were, it is morally certain that Justin Martyr would have quoted them by name, and by name have mentioned their authors.

With the minor writers of the second century the case is somewhat different. It is to the latter part of the second century that the collection of genuine documents or the fabrication of false ones is mostly due, and for that reason it is desirable to examine minutely the list of writers who are supposed to have lived during that time, and the works or fragments of works which now remain and which pass under their names. For this purpose I shall place before the reader every fragment that exists of all the minor writers of the second century, and shall hereafter refer to them under the name of each apostle or other early Christian, whether writer or not, whose life is associated either with Jesus as his contemporary or with any other prominent character to whom my present work applies.

It may be observed, however, before producing these fragments, that the treatises of Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus and Hermias were written after those of Justin Martyr, and we cannot tell how long after. The few passages in which apparent reference is made to the Apostolic Epistles will require to be noticed hereafter.

There are also larger works of a different character, entitled Clementine Homilies, Recognitions, Apostolical Constitutions, and Sibylline Oracles, which owe their origin perhaps to the end of the second century and will be noticed in their turn.

Meanwhile the minor writers of this period, whose works have perished except the extracts which have been made from them by Eusebius mostly, and by a few others, are the following :

1. Apollonius. 2. Claudius Apollinaris. 3. Dionysius. 4. Hegesippus. 5. Melito. 6. Pantænus. 7. Papias. 8. Pinytus. 9. Polycrates. 10. Quadratus. 11. Rhodon. 12. Serapion.

We know almost nothing of any of these, beyond what is here prefixed to the fragments of each writer.

There are also a few others from whom extracts have been preserved, but not in their own original words : and there are a few letters and fragments from anonymous elders and others, writing in the name of councils or other societies of Christians, such as were common in those primitive times.

I. Apollonius.

Of Apollonius the Phrygian we know only that he wrote several works against the prevailing Heresies. Eusebius

alone has preserved some passages from his writings about Montanus, and certain prophets, prophetesses, and martyrs.

1. Who this new teacher [Montanus] is, his works and his teaching show. It is he who teaches the dissolution of marriages, who has ordained fasts, who named Pepusa and Tymion Jerusalem (now these are small cities of Phrygia) wishing to gather there those from every quarter, [he] who appointed collectors of money, who invents the receiving of bribes under the name of offerings, who furnishes salaries to those who preach his word, that the teaching of his word may be strengthened by gluttony.

2. We show them that these prophetesses were the first, from the time that they were filled with the spirit, who left their husbands. How then did they speak falsely, calling Prisca a virgin?

3. All scripture seems to me to forbid a prophet to take bribes and money. When then I see the prophetess having taken both gold and silver and costly clothing, how shall I not renounce her?

4. Moreover Themison also, clothed with marvellous covetousness, who bore not the sign of confession but by the multitude of his money put away his bonds, when he ought to have been humble-minded on that head, dared, boasting like a martyr, in imitation of the apostle, having drawn up a catholic epistle, to teach those who believed better than himself, and to strive with the words of emptiness, and to utter blasphemy against the Lord and his apostles, and the holy church.

5. But, that we may not speak of more, let the prophetess tell us about Alexander who called himself a martyr, with whom she feasts, to whom also many make obeisance, whose piracies and other deeds of daring, for which he has been punished, it behoves not us to speak, but the back-chamber [register-office] holds them. Who then forgives any one his sins? Does the prophets forgive the confessor his thefts, or the martyr forgive the prophet his covetousness? For though our Lord said, "Possess not gold, nor silver, nor two coats," these have offended altogether contrariwise in the possession of these forbidden things. For we will show that those who are called prophets and confessors among them, make gain not only from the rich, but also from the poor and orphans and widows. And, if they have confidence, let them stand on this, and try the question with us on these conditions, that, if they are refuted, they shall cease offending for the future: for the fruits of the prophet must be proved; for from the fruit the tree is known. But that those who wish may know about Alexander, he was judged by Æmilius Frontinus the procon-

sul in Ephesus, not on account of the name, but of the robberies which he committed, being already a transgressor: then having lied against the name of the Lord, he was set free after he had led astray the faithful there. And his own district, from which he was, did not receive him, because he was a robber, and those who wish to know about him, have the public office of Asia to refer to. Him the prophet knows not though he was many years with him; and we, in refuting him, refute also through him the standing ground of the prophet. We can show the like in the case of many: and, if they are confident, let them abide the test.

6. If they deny that their prophets have taken bribes, let them acknowledge this, that, if they be proved to have taken them, they are not prophets. And we will furnish endless proofs of these things. But all the fruits of a prophet must be tested. Tell me, Does a prophet dip himself in colours? Does a prophet stain his eyebrows? Does a prophet love ornament? Does a prophet play with tables and dice? Does a prophet lend on usury? Let them confess whether these things are lawful or not, and I will show that they are done among them.

II. Claudius Apollinaris.

He was bishop of Hierapolis under the emperor Antoninus Pius, to whom he dedicated a work in defence of Christianity. In the time of Jerome were still extant his work against the Gentiles in five books, his two books on the truth of Christianity and against the Cataphryges or Montanists.

The first two fragments of this writer are from his book concerning Easter, and are quoted in the preface to the Paschal Chronicle: the third, from an uncertain work, is quoted by Eusebius.

1. There are some who from ignorance strive concerning these things, being in a pardonable case: for ignorance does not admit of accusation, but needs instruction. And they say that the Lord ate the lamb with his disciples on the fourteenth day, but himself suffered on the great day of unleavened bread: and they say that Matthew so speaks as they have understood it: wherefore their sense is not in agreement with the law: and the gospels seem according to them to be at variance. [*Præfat. Chronici Paschalis*, p. 6, ed. Ducang.]

2. The fourteenth day is the true passover of the Lord, the great sacrifice, the Son of God that was instead of the lamb,

the bound one who bound the strong, and the judge who was judge of living and dead; and he that was delivered into the hands of sinners, that he might be crucified, he that was exalted on the wings of the unicorn, and that was pierced in his holy side, he that poured out of his side the two things that purify, water and blood, the word and the spirit; and he that was buried on the day of the Passover, a stone being placed upon the tomb. [*Chron. Pasch. ibid.*]

3. From that time, he says, the legion which had wrought this miracle by prayer, received from the emperor a name suitable to the fact, being called in the language of the Romans the Thundering legion. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* v, 5.]

III. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth.

He lived under the Antonines, and was the author of eight epistles, of which a few fragments, from his Epistle to the Romans, are preserved by Eusebius alone.

1. Thus you also by such admonition blended together the planting of the Romans and Corinthians that arose from Peter and Paul. For both also, when they planted us into our own Corinth, likewise taught us: and likewise also having carried their teachings into Italy also, they became martyrs at the same time. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* ii, 25.]

2. For it is a custom among you from the beginning, to do good to all the brethren in various ways, and to send supplies to many churches in every city, refreshing in this way the poverty of the needy, and giving supplies to the brethren in the mines, maintaining, ye Romans, by the supplies which ye send from ancient times, the custom of Romans handed down from your fathers, which your blessed bishop Soter has not only kept up, but also increased, furnishing the abundance which is distributed among the saints, and with blessed words comforting the brethren who got up to him, as a loving father does his children. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* iv, 23.]

3. To-day we have celebrated the Lord's holy day, in which we read your letter, which we shall always have to read and to advise you, as the former also that was written to us by Clement. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* iv, 23.]

4. For when the brethren asked me to write epistles, I wrote them. And these the apostles of the devil filled with tares, taking out some things, and adding others. For whom is laid up the woe! It is therefore no wonder if also some have set

themselves to trifle with the writings of our Lord, since they have attempted to do so with these which are not such as those. [Euseb. *Eccles. Hist.* iv, 23.]

IV. Hegesippus.

This is one of the most important of the early Christian writers whose works have perished. Eusebius tells us, in his Ecclesiastical History (iv, 22), that he was probably a Jew converted to Christianity. He infers this from the fact that Hegesippus quotes from the Gospel of the Hebrews, and also generally from the Hebrew language: but this argument is not conclusive. The Jews seldom spoke any other language than their own, and the name Hegesippus is pure Greek, and pre-eminently so even among the early Christian writers, who were all Greeks with scarcely any exception. We learn from the same ecclesiastical historian, that Hegesippus wrote "memoranda of the steady tradition (or handing down) of apostolic teaching in five books, and in the most simple style of writing." And Eusebius points out that, whereas the author of that work speaks of Antinoüs, the slave and favourite of the emperor Hadrian, and of the city built by him and called after his name, he clearly indicates the time after which he must have written his history. We are not at present concerned with the voyage of Hegesippus to Rome; and, as Eusebius merely alludes to the observations which the same historian made on the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, but does not tell us what those observations were, further than that the Epistle was read in the churches up to his own times, we need not dwell on a subject so uncertain. There is no mention of the Acts of the Apostles, nor of writings by St Peter, St Paul, or any other of the Apostles and contemporaries of Jesus Christ, in any of the passages which Eusebius has preserved of his work. His account of James, "brother of the Lord," of Judas and others, bears on its surface marks of that imaginative faculty which the early Christian writers undoubtedly possessed; but there may be some truth underlying the narrative, which brings us so closely into connection with Jesus Christ himself. Eusebius, in his own words (iii, 11) and not in an actual quotation, tells us that Clopas was described as the brother of Joseph, and consequently the uncle of our Lord: it is much to be regretted that the

historian did not quote fully the words of Hegesippus in which so important a fact was stated.

1. James, the brother of the Lord, receives the church from the apostles, termed Just by all from the times of the Lord even until us. For many were called James; but he was holy even from his mother's womb: he drank not wine nor strong drink, neither ate anything living. Razor went not up on his head; he anointed not with oil, and used not bath. To him alone it was lawful to enter into the holy places. For neither did he wear woollen, but linen. And he went alone into the temple, and was found lying upon his knees, and asking forgiveness for the people, so that his knees became hard like a camel, because he was always bending them in worship of God, and asking forgiveness for the people. On account of the excess of his righteousness he was called Righteous and *Oblias*, which is in Greek bulwark of the people and righteousness, as the prophets show concerning him. Some then of the seven heresies that were among the people, which have been described before in my memoirs, asked him, which was the gate of Jesus; and he said that this was the Saviour. Of whom some believed that Jesus is the Christ. But the heresies aforesaid did not believe either the resurrection, or that he will come and render to each according to his works. But as many as believed, it was through James. When then many of the rulers believed, there was a tumult of the Jews, both scribes and Pharisees saying that all the people ran a risk of looking after Jesus as the Christ. They then coming together said to James, "We exhort thee: restrain the people, since they have gone astray to Jesus, as if he were the Christ: we exhort thee to persuade all that have come to the day of the passover concerning Christ: for we all obey thee. For we bear thee witness, and so do all the people, that thou art righteous and acceptest no person. Persuade the people then not to err concerning Jesus. For both all the people and we all obey thee. Stand then on the pinnacle of the Temple, that thou mayest be visible aloft, and that thy words may be audible to all the people. For all the tribes with the nations also have come together on account of the passover." The aforesaid scribes and Pharisees then placed James on the pinnacle of the Temple, and cried to him and said, "Thou righteous man, whom we all are bound to obey, since the people wanders after Jesus that was crucified, tell us which is the door of Jesus." And he answered with a loud voice, "Why do ye ask me concerning Jesus the son of man? And he sitteth in heaven on the right hand of the great power, and is about to come on the clouds of heaven." And when many were fully assured, and glorified at the testimony of James and said, Hosanna to the son of David, then again the same scribes and Pharisees said to one another, "We have done

ill in giving such a testimony to Jesus: but let us go up and cast him down, that they may be frightened and not believe him." And they cried out saying, "Oh, oh! the righteous man also is gone astray." And they fulfilled the Scripture which is written in Isaiah, "Let us remove the just, for he is a stumbling-block unto us: therefore they eat the offspring of their own works." They therefore went up and cast down the righteous man, and said to one another, "Let us stone James the Just." And they began to stone him, since when cast down he did not die, but he turning, bent his knees, saying, "I pray thee, Lord God Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." But when they were thus stoning him, one of the priests sons of Rhechab son of Rhachabim witnessed by Jeremiah the prophet cried saying, "Be still: what are ye doing? the righteous man prays for you." And one of the fullers of them, having taken the club with which he beat the clothes, dashed it against the just man's head. And thus he became a martyr. And they buried him at the place by the temple, and his pillar still remains by the temple. He was a true witness to the Jews and the Greeks, that Jesus is the Christ. And immediately Vespasian besieges them. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* ii, 23.]

2. There were still surviving those of the family of our Lord, children's children of Judas, who is called after the flesh his brother, whom they pointed out as being of the race of David. Juocatus brought these to Domitian Cæsar: for he feared the coming of Christ, as did also Herod. And he asked them if they were descended from David: and they confessed it. Then he asked them how many possessions they had, or of how much property they were possessed. But they both said that nine thousand denarii alone belonged to them, the half belonging to each of them. And they said that they had these not in money, but in valuation of thirty-nine measures only of land, from which also they paid the taxes, and maintained themselves by their own labour upon it. And that they then also showed their hands, exhibiting as a witness of their self-labour the hardness of their bodies, and the callosities imprinted upon their own hands from the constant work. But when asked about Christ and his kingdom, of what nature it was, and where and when it would appear, they made a statement, that it was not worldly nor earthly, but heavenly and angelic, about to come at the completion of the age, when he coming in glory should judge quick and dead, and he shall render to each according to his pursuits. At which things that Domitian passed no judgment upon them, but also despising them as simple, let them go free, and by proclamation put a stop to the persecution against the church. But that they, being freed, took the lead of the churches, as being at the same time martyrs and of the family of the Lord, and, when there

was peace, they remained in this life until the time of Trajan. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* iii, 20.]

3. They (the grandsons of Judas) come then and take the lead of all the church, as witnesses and of the family of the Lord. And, when there was a dead quiet in all the church, they remained until the time of Trajan Cæsar. Until the aforesaid Symeon, son of Clopas, of the uncle of our Lord, having been informed against by the heresies, was himself also in like manner accused on the same charge in the time of Atticus the consular. And being scourged for many days, he became a martyr, so that all wondered exceedingly, and the consul also, how he persevered, being an hundred and twenty years old: and he was ordered to be crucified. [*Eccl. Hist.* iii, 32.]

4. For whom they made cenotaphs and shrines as until this day: of whom is also Antinoüs the slave of Hadrian Cæsar; for whom also are celebrated the Antinoëan games, which took place in our times. For he also established both a city surnamed from Antinoüs, and prophets. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* iv, 8.]

5. And the church of the Corinthians remained in the right doctrine until Primus bishop in Corinth: with whom I joined company, as I was sailing to Rome, and I spent with the Corinthians many days, in which we found enjoyment in the right faith. But being in Rome, I made my reception with Anicetus, whose minister [deacon] was Eleutherus. And after Anicetus succeeds Soter, after whom was Eleutherus. But in each succession and in each city so it is, as the law orders, and the prophets, and the Lord. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* iv, 22.]

6. And after James the Just had become a martyr like the Lord for the same doctrine, again Symeon son of Clopas from his uncle becomes bishop, whom all set forth for second, being cousin of the Lord. On account of this they called the church a virgin; for it had not yet been defiled by vain hearings. Thebuthis was the first to corrupt it, because he was not made bishop. From the seven heresies, (of which also he came among the people, of which was Simon, whence the Simonians, and Cleobios, whence the Cleobienians, and Dositheus, whence the Dositheanians, and Gorthæus, whence the Gorathenians, and Masbotheos, whence the Masbothæans, from these the Menandrianistæ, and the Marcionistæ, and Carpocratianians, and Valentinianians, and Basilidiani, and Saturniliani) each severally and otherwise advanced their private glory. From these arose false Christs, false prophets, false apostles, who severed the unity of the church with corrupt words against God and against his Christ. [*E. C.* iv, 22.]

7. There were these different opinions in the circumcision among the sons of Israel of those from the tribe of Judah and the Christ: Essæans, Galilæans, Day-baptizers, Masbotheans, Samaritæ, Sadducees, Pharisees. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* iv, 22.]

8. Of these heretics some accuse Symeon the son of Clopas as being descended from David and a Christian: and so he, being an hundred and twenty years old, becomes a martyr in the time of Trajanus Cæsar and the consular Atticus. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* iii, 32.]

V. Melito, Bishop of Sardis.

This writer, about whom much discussion has existed among students and critics of ecclesiastical history, appears to have written several works; namely, 1. On the Passover. 2. An Apology for Christianity addressed to the Emperor Marcus Antoninus Verus. 3. Selections on the Old Testament. 4. On Christ's Incarnation. 5. Sermon on Christ's Passion. Nine fragments of his writings have been preserved; three of which cannot be referred for certain to either of the works which have here been named. The two volumes published under his name by Dom Pitra in the *Spicilegium Solismense*, could only be of antiquarian and not historical value, if they were genuine; but there is some doubt about the name of the author, whether Miletus or Mellitus or Melito is the true reading. The extracts from his works which follow, are possibly or even probably genuine.

1. In the time of Servilius Paulus, proconsul of Asia, at which time Sagaris became a martyr, there arose a great inquiry in Laodicea about the passover which fell seasonably in those days. And these things were then written. [Euseb. iv, 26.]

2. (*To the emperor M. A. Verus.*) For what never happened before, the race of those who worship God is persecuted, being driven by new decrees throughout Asia. For shameless informers and lovers of others' goods, taking occasion from these ordinances, openly plunder us, day and night robbing those who do no wrong.

. . . . . .

And if these things are done by your command, let it be well done. For a just king could never follow unjust counsels. And we with pleasure bear the honour of such a death. But we prefer to you this request, in order that having first taken notice

of the workers of this contention, you may judge them justly, if they are worthy of death and punishment or of safety and peace. But if this counsel and this new ordinance, which is not even proper against hostile barbarians, do not proceed from you, we pray you so much the more, not to neglect us in such a public persecution.

. . . . . .

For our philosophy flourished before among barbarians, and flourishing among your nations under the great rule of Augustus your predecessor, became especially a fortunate advantage to your reign. For from that time the power of the Romans grew to size and brilliancy. Of whom you have become and will be the much-loved successor with your son, protecting that philosophy which helps to support the empire and which began with Augustus; which also your predecessors honoured in addition to the other forms of worship. And this is the greatest proof of our philosophy having flourished for good in conjunction with the happily beginning empire, from no harm having befallen us since the rule of Augustus, but the contrary, everything bright and glorious according to the prayers of all. Alone of all of them, persuaded by some envious men, Nero and Domitian sought to place our doctrine under calumny: from whom also it happened that the falsehood of the accusation concerning such persons flowed by unreasoning communication. But your pious forefathers set right their ignorance, often smiting in writing many who dared to alter any thing about them. Among whom your grandfather Hadrian appears to have written both to many others, and to Fundanus the proconsul, governor of Asia. But your father, when you also were governing all things for him, wrote to the cities that they should make no alteration concerning us: amongst whom also he wrote to the Larissæans, and to the Thessalonians and Athenians, and to all the Greeks. But we are persuaded that, as you even more hold on these things the same opinion as they, and are much more of a philanthropist and a philosopher, will do all things that we ask of you. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* iv, 26.]

3. We are not worshipers of stones that have no feeling, but of God only, who was before all and over all, and moreover we are worshipers of his Christ, who was truly the Word of God before ages. [*Auctor Chronici Paschalis*, ad pag. 259, ed. Ducang.]

4. *Melito to Onesimus his brother greeting.* Whereas you have often asked, in your zeal towards our doctrine, to have selections made for you from the law and the prophets concerning the Saviour and all our faith, and moreover also wished to learn the

accuracy of the ancient books, how many they are in number and what in order, I have taken pains to do so, knowing your zeal about the faith, and your love of learning about the doctrine, and that you most of all men prefer these things in your zeal towards God, striving for everlasting salvation. Having then traveled into the east, and gone as far as the place where they were preached and made, and having accurately learnt the books of the old covenant, I have drawn them up and sent it to you. Of which the names are, Five of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Leviticus, Deuteronomy; Jesus Nave, Judges, Ruth, Four of Kings, Two of Omissions, of the Psalms of David, Proverbs of Solomon, which is also Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Job; of Prophets Esaiah, Jeremiah; of the twelve in one book: Daniel, Ezekiel, Esdras. From which I have also made selections, dividing them into six books. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* iv, 26.]

5. (*Against Marcion.*) There is no need for those who have sense, out of the things which Christ did after his baptism, to prove the real and not apparent nature of his soul and his body, that human nature which is like ourselves. For, (says Melito) the things done by Christ after his baptism, and especially the signs, showed the divinity hidden under his flesh, and confirmed it to the world. For the same, being at the same time God and perfect man, ratified to us his two essences; his divinity through the miracles in the three years after his baptism, and his human nature in the thirty periods before his baptism, during which, on account of the imperfection according to the flesh, the signs of his divinity were hidden, although being true God before the ages. [Anastasius Sinaita, *in Hodego suo, cont. Acephalos*, xiii, 260, ed. Gretseri.]

6. God suffered by the right hand of an Israelitish woman. [Anastas. *ibid.* c. xii, p. 216.]

7. And our Lord Jesus Christ was bound as a ram, and was shorn as a lamb, and was led like a sheep to the slaughter, and was crucified: and he carried the wood on his shoulders, being led up to be sacrificed like Isaac by his father. But Christ suffered, whereas Isaac did not suffer; for he was a type of Christ that was about to suffer: but he also who was a type of Christ caused stupor and fear to men. For it was a new mystery to see a son brought by his father to a mountain for sacrifice, whom having bound he placed upon the logs of consumption, getting ready with haste the preparations for his sacrifice. But Isaac is silent, being fettered like a ram, not opening his mouth nor speaking with his voice. For not fearing the sword, nor

trembling at the fire, nor grieving at suffering, he bore patiently the type of the Lord. Isaac then was set forth in the midst fettered like a ram, and Abraham standing by and holding the naked sword, not being ashamed to slay his son. [*In Schedis Grabii Bodleianis, ex Catena in Genesin MS. sumptum.*]

8. The ram appeared for sacrifice on behalf of Isaac the Just, that Isaac might be released from bonds. It, being slain, redeemed Isaac. So also the Lord being sacrificed saved us, and being bound released us, and being sacrificed redeemed us.

. . . . . .

For the Lord was the lamb as a ram, which Abraham saw held in the bush of Sabec, but the bush set forth the cross, and that place Jerusalem, and the lamb the Lord entangled for a sacrifice. [*Ibid.*]

9. By "being held by the horns" the Syriac and the Hebrew mean "hanging," so as more clearly to denote the cross: but also "the ram," in that it is right: for it does not say "lamb,' young as Isaac, but "ram," adult like the Lord. But as by the bush of Sabec, that is of remission, he denoted the holy cross, so also Ezekiel at the end calls water of remission that which typifies holy baptism. For there are two things which furnish remission of sins, suffering on account of Christ, and baptism. [*Caten. MSta Vatic. et Nicephori Catena in Octateuch.* Lips.]

VI. Pantænus of Alexandria.

The best account we have of this writer is from Jerome: as follows. "Pantænus, a stoic philosopher, according to an old custom at Alexandria, where there were always ecclesiastical teachers from the time of Mark the Evangelist, was a man of such great prudence and erudition, both in sacred and profane literature, that, at the request of certain ambassadors from India, he was sent into that country by Demetrius Bishop of Alexandria. There he found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve apostles, had preached the coming of Christ according to the Gospel of Matthew, and on his return brought it back with him to Alexandria, written in Hebrew letters. Many of his commentaries on Holy Scripture are still extant, but he profited the churches most by his living voice. He taught under Severus and Antoninus surnamed Caracalla." [*De Viris ill.* 36.]

1. Prophecy uses words indefinitely, for the most part, and

uses the present tense for the future, and again the present for the past. [Clemens Alex. *Eclog. ex Prophetis*, § lvi.]

2. (*God knows*) neither sensible things by the senses, nor intellectual things by the intellect. For it is not possible that he who is above things that be should comprehend things that be by things that be. But we say that God knows things that be as his own acts of volition, adding also the reasonableness of reason; for, if he made all things by his will and no reason opposes, but it is always righteous and just to say that God knows his own will, and he willingly made each of things that are, therefore God knows the things that be, as his own acts of volition, since also he willingly made the things that be. [Maximi *Scholia in Greg. Theol. ad finem Joan. Erigenæ Scoti de Divisione Nat.* ed. Gale, p. 19.]

VII. Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis.

Eusebius has given us his estimate of this writer, that he was "a little-minded man;" and although this estimate is probably just, yet the loss of his writings is much to be regretted; for his "Explanation of our Lord's Sayings" would perhaps have thrown much light on the parables and other discourses found in the four gospels. It must also be stated that according to Eusebius (iii, 39) Papias does not claim to have been a hearer of the apostles, but only of those who had known the apostles. It is not to be denied that there is a very remarkable peculiarity in the style of Christ's discourses, which indicates his teaching more clearly than any marks now remaining specify the doctrine of the most celebrated Grecian philosophers.

1. But I will not hesitate to set down in writing to you also whatever things I formerly well learnt from the elders and well remembered, maintaining the truth about them. For I did not take pleasure like most men in those who spoke the most, but in those who taught the truth, not in those who quoted the commands of others, but those who delivered the commands given by our Lord in the faith, and springing out of the truth itself. But if by chance also any one came who had followed the elders, I examined the words of the elders; what said Andrew, or Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or what John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples? as for instance what Aristion and the elder John, our Lord's disciples, say. For I did not consider that what came out of books would benefit me so much as what came from the living and abiding voice. [Euseb. iii, 39.]

2. The first Christians called those who studied purity before God by the name of children. [Maximi *Scholia in Dionys. de Cœlesti Hierarchia*, ed. Corderii, cap. ii, p. 32.]

3. Judas walked in this world a great example of impiety. For being swelled so much in flesh, that he could not pass through, when a cart passed through easily, he was crushed by the cart, so that his entrails were evacuated. [Œcumenii *Comment. in Acta Apostol.* cap. ii.]

4. As the elders, who saw John the disciple of our Lord, have recorded, that they heard from him, according as the Lord taught about those times, saying, "The days shall come, in which vineyards shall grow, each having ten thousand branches, and on one branch ten thousand arms, and on one arm ten thousand twigs, and on each twig ten thousand clusters, and in each cluster ten thousand grapes, and each grape when squeezed will give twenty-five measures of wine. And when any one of the saints shall lay hold of a cluster, another shall cry out, 'I am a better cluster; take me; through me bless the Lord.' In the same way also that a grain of wheat shall produce ten thousand ears, and each ear shall have ten thousand grains, and each grain five two-pound measures of fine clean flour; and other fruits and seeds, and herbs according to the fittingness which belongs to them, and that all the animals which use those kinds of food which are received from the earth, should become peaceful and docile, being subject to men in all subjection. . . . . But these things are credible to believers. And when Judas the traitor (*he says*) did not believe and asked 'How then shall such productions be brought to pass by the Lord?' the Lord said, 'They shall see who shall come among them.' Now Isaias prophesying speaks of those times, 'And the wolf shall lie down with the lamb, &c.'" [Irenæi *adv. Hæres.* v, 33.]

5. And, as the elders say, those who shall then be thought worthy of the society of heaven, shall pass thither, that is into heaven: some shall enjoy the delights of paradise; but others shall possess the beauty of the city: for the Saviour shall everywhere be seen, as those shall be worthy who see him. But that there shall be this difference in the dwelling of those who bear fruit an hundred-fold, and those who sixty-fold, and those who thirty-fold: of whom some shall be taken up into heaven, and some shall dwell in paradise, and some shall inhabit the city: and that on this account the Lord has said, In my father's house there are many mansions: for all things are God's, who gives to all a suitable habitation; according as his Word says that to all is distributed by the Father, according as each is worthy or shall be. And this is the couch, on which those shall sit, who feast

as invited guests at the nuptials. That this is the arrangement and disposition of those who are saved, we are told by the elders who were disciples of the apostles, and that they advance by steps of this kind, and ascend by the Spirit to the Son, and by the Son to the Father, the Son thenceforth ceding his work to the Father, according as it was said by the apostle, that he must reign, until he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For in the times of his kingdom the just man, living upon the earth, shall now forget to die. But when (*says he*) he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. But when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son of Man also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. [IREN. *adv. Hæres.* lib. v, cap. ult.]

6. And this the elder said. Mark became the expounder of Peter, and wrote accurately whatever he delivered, not indeed in a regular order, such things as were either said or done by Christ. For he was neither a hearer nor a follower of Christ. But afterwards, as I said, he followed Peter, who delivered his teachings as occasion served, but did not make a regular arrangement of our Lord's words: so that Mark made no error, thus writing some things as he delivered them. For he took forethought of one thing, not to leave out any thing of what he heard, or to make a mistake about any thing therein. *Ibid.*

7. Matthew, then, in the Hebrew dialect wrote the sayings; and each person interpreted them as he was able. *Ibid.*

8. "To some of them (*the angels*) he gave to rule over the administration of the earth, and he enjoined them to rule it well." And then he says, "But it happened that their appointment came to nothing." [ANDR. CÆSARIENSIS, *Comm. in Apocalypsin*, cxxxiv, Serm. 12, ad calcem; ed. Morel. Opp. S. Chrysos. p. 52.]

9. Mary mother of the Lord:
Mary wife of Cleophas or Alpheus, who was mother of James the bishop and apostle, and of Simon and Thaddeus, and of a certain Joseph:
Mary Salome, wife of Zebedee, mother of John the evangelist and of James:
Mary Magdalene: Those four are found in the Gospel.
James and Judas and Joseph were sons of the Lord's aunt.
James also and John were sons of the Lord's other aunt.
Mary, mother of James the Less and of Joseph, wife of

Alpheus, was sister of Mary our Lord's mother, whom John names "of Cleophas," either from her father, or from her gentile family, or some other cause.

Mary Salome is called either from her husband, or from a village; some say that this same was "of Cleophas," because she had two husbands.

[*Cod.* MS. 2307, *Biblioth. Bodl.* fol. 286, col. 2.]

VIII. Pinytus, Bishop of Gnossus.

He is known only for a letter which he wrote to Dionysius of Corinth.

(*He exhorts him to*) give now some more solid food, nourishing the people that are under him for the future with more perfect writings, that they may not, by dwelling always on honey'd words, grow old imperceptibly on childish nurture. [Euseb. iv, 23.]

IX. Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus.

He was the principal person who upheld the Asiatic mode of celebrating Easter, and wrote to Victor of Rome the letter of which the following fragment alone is preserved.

We then celebrate the indisputable day, neither adding to it nor taking from it. For in Asia also great elements have been laid to sleep: which will rise again on the day of the coming of the Lord, in which he comes with glory from heaven, and will seek out all the saints, Philip one of the twelve apostles, who sleeps in Hierapolis, and his two daughters, virgins who have grown old. And his other daughter whose conversation was in the Holy Spirit, rests in Ephesus. But moreover also John, who leaned on the breast of the Lord, who became a priest bearing the plate, and martyr and teacher, he sleeps in Ephesus. Moreover Polycarp also both bishop and martyr in Smyrna, and Thraseas who was both bishop and martyr: and Thraseas who was both bishop and martyr of Eumenia, who sleeps in Smyrna. Why need I speak of Sagaris bishop and martyr, who sleeps in Laodicea? Moreover also the blessed Papirius, and Melito the eunuch, whose conversation was wholly in the Holy Spirit: he lies in Sardis waiting for the overseership from heaven, in which he shall rise from the dead. All these kept the day of the fourteenth of the passover according to the gospel, transgressing in nothing, but following according to the rule of the faith. Moreover I also Polycrates the least of all of you,

according to the tradition of my kinsmen, some of whom I have followed.—I had seven kinsmen bishops, and I the eighth: and my kinsmen always celebrated the day, when the people removed the leaven—I then, my brethren, being sixty-five years in the Lord, and having conferred with the brethren of the whole world, and having gone through all sacred writing, am not disturbed at those who threaten us; for those who are greater than I have said, we must obey God rather than men.

. . . . . .

I could name the bishops that were present, whom you ordered to be assembled by me, and I sent for them: whose names if I write, they are large numbers. But those who have seen my small man, have consented to the letter, knowing that I have not borne my grey hairs in vain, but have ever conversed in the Lord Jesus. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* v, 24.]

X. Quadratus, Bishop of Athens.

He was contemporary with Aristides, and presented to the emperor Hadrian an apology for the Christians, in which he spoke of the miraculous cures of persons who lived down to his own times. We should be glad to find a work in which positive proof was shown for miracles performed since the time of Christ and his immediate disciples.

The works of our Saviour were always present; for they were real: those who had been healed, those who rose from the dead, who not only were seen when healed and risen, but also always present. Nor only whilst the Saviour was dwelling among the people, but also when he was gone, for a long time, so that some of them have arrived even to our times. [Euseb. iv, 3.]

XI. Rhodon.

Rhodon, an Asiatic, was a disciple of Tatian at Rome in the time of Commodus and Severus. He wrote on the Hexahemeron and against the Phrygian heretics.

1. (*Against Marcion.*) On this account also they were inharmonious among themselves, holding an unstable opinion. For one of their crew, Apelles, who assumed a grave demeanour and old age, confesses one beginning, but says that prophecies are of a contrary spirit, in obedience to the declarations of an inspired virgin named Philumene. Others, as also the sailor Marcion himself, introduce two beginnings. Of whom are

both Potitus and Basilicus. And these, following that Pontic wolf, and not finding the distinction of things, as he also did not, turned to recklessness, and declared two beginnings simply and without proof. But others of them again, turning off to the worse, lay down not only two, but also three natures, of whom the leader and champion is Syneros, as those say who put forth his teaching.

. . . . . .

2. For old Apelles having joined us was convicted of saying many things falsely: wherefore also he said that it was not right at all to question the doctrine, but that each should remain, as he believed. For he declared that those who trusted in him that was crucified would be saved, only if they are found in good works. But that which was most obscure of all things taught by him, as we have said before, was about God. For he spoke of one beginning, as also is our doctrine.

. . . . . .

3. But when I said to him, Tell us where you get this demonstration, or how you can speak of one beginning: he said that the prophecies refuted themselves, because they said nothing at all true: for they are discordant and false and opposite to one another. But he said he did not know how there is one beginning, but only that he was so moved. Then when I had sworn to speak the truth, he swore that he spoke the truth in saying that he did not know how there is one unbegotten God, but this he believed. But I condemned him with laughter, because, though he said he was a teacher, he did not know how to confirm that which was taught by him. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* v, 13.]

XII. Serapion, Bishop of Antioch.

Serapion was made bishop of Antioch in the 11th year of Commodus, and wrote an epistle to Caricus and Pontius against the Montanists; and also against the Judaizing of Domninus, the Gospel of Peter, Epistles, &c.

1. (To Carinus and Pontius.) But that ye may see this also that the working of this false order called the new prophecy is abominated among all the brotherhood in the world, I have sent to you also the writings of the blessed Claudius Apollinarius, who was bishop of Hierapolis in Asia.

. . . . . .

I Aurelius Cyrenius martyr pray that you are well!

. . . . . .

Ælius Publius Julius, bishop, from Debeltum, a colony of Thrace.

The Lord liveth, that is in heaven, that the blessed Sotas of Anchialus wished to cast out the devil of Priscilla, and the hypocrites would not let him. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* v, 19.]

2. (On the Gospel of St Peter.) For we, brethren, receive both Peter and the other apostles like as we do Christ: but, as knowing men, we beg to be excused about their falsely inscribed names, knowing that we received not such. For I, when I was among you, supposed that you all adhered to the true faith. And when I had not gone through the gospel put forth by them in the name of Peter, I said, If this is all that seems to cause you discouragement, let it be read. But now that I have learnt that their mind finds a covering for itself in a certain heresy from the words spoken by me, I will hasten again to go to you: so that, brethren, expect me quickly. But we, brethren, know now to what heresy Marcian belonged, and opposed himself, not thinking what he was saying, which ye will learn from what was written to you. For we had it in our power from others who supported this same gospel, that is from the successors of those who began it, whom we call Docetæ (for the most part of those sentiments are from their teaching), to borrow it from them and go through it, and find the greater part of the true doctrine of our Saviour, but some things also deviating therefrom, which also we have submitted unto you. [Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* vi, 12.]

From these fragments we learn several interesting particulars of early Christianity, but very little bearing upon the books of the New Testament or on the history of the Apostles during or after the events which are recorded in the Acts.

There are indeed notices of other writers who lived in the second century, but none of their works have been preserved. Many of these writers have been described as heretics, whom the more orthodox would be bound in duty to oppose, or at least to suppress their writings. Of these the names of Bardesanes, Basileides, Valentinian, Cerdo, Marcion, and others, are well known, but the controversies, which have been carried on about the doctrines which they taught, are far removed from our present subject, and the aid which they might be supposed to furnish to our enquiry concerning the New Testament and its writers, especially those of the epistles, is of the scantiest dimensions. Those which here follow are nearly all the writers of this class.

XIII. Aristides

is quoted in the Martyrology of Usuard as recording that Dionysius the Areopagite, to whom were once ascribed so many spurious works, suffered death by martyrdom.

XIV. Anonymous Elders

are quoted by Eirenæus, as uttering sentiments loosely expressed, and conveying no meaning that can entitle them to our notice.

XV. Agrippa Castor.

We learn from Eusebius (iv, 7), quoting from Eirenæus, and from Jerome (*de Viris illustribus*, 21), quoting probably from Eusebius, that Agrippa Castor, a very learned man, wrote a work in twenty books on the Gospel, naming as prophets Barcabbas and Barcoph, and also wrote many other things concerning the heresy of Basileides. But the whole of this statement is very obscure, and not given as a direct quotation in the words of Agrippa himself.

XVI. Ariston of Pella,

who lived in the reign of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, is quoted by Maximus in his commentary on Dionysius the Areopagite as the author of a dialogue of Papiscus and Jason.

XVII. The Martyrs of Lyons

wrote a letter to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome, which was sent and perhaps written by Eirenæus. One fragment of it is preserved by Eusebius (v, 4).

XVIII. The Churches of Lyons and Vienne

have left a long letter giving narratives of martyrs of no importance to our present subject. [Euseb. v, 1-4.]

XIX. The Council of Cæsarea

addressed a letter on Easter and the Passover. A single

fragment is preserved by Eusebius, v, 25. The dispute concerning the day on which Easter should be celebrated, was continued in England down to the days of Venerable Bede.

XX. Synodical Letter of the Council of Lyons

written by Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, to Victor, bishop of Rome. From the two fragments of this letter, preserved, one by Eusebius (v, 24), the other by Maximus (serm. vii), a few lines may be quoted.

When the blessed Polycarp was sojourning at Rome in the days of Anicetus, when also they had some small matters with one another concerning other subjects, they immediately made peace, not being fond of strife against one another on this head. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to keep it, seeing that he had always kept it with John the disciple of our Lord, and with the other disciples with whom he dwelt, nor did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to keep it, for he said that he ought to retain the custom of the elders who went before him. [Euseb. v, 24.]

XXI. An Anonymous Elder

is quoted by Eusebius (vi, 14) from the Hypotyposes, a lost work of Clemens Alexandrinus, and seems to have endeavoured to show that our Epistle to the Hebrews was written by St Paul in Hebrew and turned into Greek by St Luke.

CHAPTER VIII.

JUSTIN MARTYR, ATHENAGORAS, TATIAN, THEOPHILUS, HERMIAS, IRENÆUS, ORIGEN, EUSEBIUS, APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS, SIBYLLINE ORACLES, CLEMENTINE RECOGNITIONS, CLEMENTINE HOMILIES, APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS.

BETWEEN the end of the first and the beginning of the third century of our era, a larger number of writings appeared in the world on the Christian history and doctrine than would be imagined by those who have never given their attention to the subject. That among this number may be included those, more worthy than the rest, which have been admitted into the canon of the Church, seems to be an inference not hastily or wrongfully drawn from arguments that are open to the judgement of all unbiased persons; but the other writings which belong to this date are of several classes. In the FIRST place we have the Apostolical Fathers, of whom a short notice has been taken in a former chapter, and of whom indeed so many treatises have appeared that it would seem difficult to add anything thereto without obscuring rather than elucidating the question of their authorship and authenticity. The most general opinion is either that they were composed by later writers bearing the same names, and so have been wrongly ascribed to their reputed authors, or that they are the works of men who, in that age of mistaken zeal, did not scruple to pass them off under the names of those who were contemporary or almost contemporary with the Apostles. The SECOND CLASS of records which furnish the scanty knowledge that we possess of these early ages of Christianity, has been given fully in our last chapter, where are found the fragments of more than twenty writers, all of whose works have perished, except these few remains, preserved mostly by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, from the beginning of the Christian era down to the year 337, when Constantine the Great was Emperor.

I am not aware that any one has impugned the verbal accuracy of Eusebius in quoting from these lost writers, but there are many other references to their writings in his History; and as he quotes them in his own, but not in their words, such notices would be useless as evidence on our

present subject. Nor indeed is the character of Eusebius for historical honesty without reproach. He describes the persecutions of the Christians in glowing and melancholy colours, as for instance in referring to the edict of Diocletian in the nineteenth year of his reign, where, however, he concludes the harrowing narrative of Christian suffering by declining to relate the dissentions and perhaps crimes of those who suffered, as not tending to the glory of God or to the credit of the Christian religion. His words are these.

All these things, indeed, have been fulfilled in our time, when we saw with our own eyes the buildings of our prayer-places thrown down from top to bottom with their very foundations, and the inspired and sacred writings delivered to the fire in the midst of the markets, and the shepherds of the churches disgracefully hidden away here and there, and some of them in unseemly manner captured and made sport of by their enemies: when too, according to another prophetical saying—"Contempt was poured out on the rulers, and he made them wander on pathless ground and not in the road."

But it is not ours to describe fully the sorrowful calamities of these men at the end, since also it does not belong to us to hand down to memory both their dissentions towards one another and their absurdities before the persecution. Wherefore also we have determined to relate nothing more about them than those things by which we may justify the divine judgment. Wherefore neither have we been induced to mention those who were made trial of by the persecution, or of those who made shipwreck altogether of their salvation and by their own will were cast off into the depths of the flood; but we shall add to the general history those incidents only which may tend to advantage for ourselves first, and then for those who follow after us. [*Hist. Eccl.* viii, 2.]

The history of the Church is continued by Socrates Scholasticus, who in the first chapter of his work confirms the impression that Eusebius is not fully trustworthy on all such matters as he thought prejudicial to the church of which he was so zealous a defender.

Eusebius the *disciple* of Pamphilus, having set forth the history of the Church in ten books in all, ended at the times of the emperor Constantine, when also the persecution, which began against the Christians from Diocletian, came to an end. The same *author*, writing on the life of Constantine, made mention partially of things concerning Areius, taking thought, as if in an

encomium, of the praises of the emperor and of panegyrical loftiness of speech *more than of comprehending facts accurately*.

It is not to be wondered that the historian of the Roman Empire should have described this conduct of Eusebius in terms which cannot be thought too severe. To acknowledge that he has related whatever might redound to the glory, and suppressed all that would tend to the discredit of religion, must naturally give rise to the suspicion that he, who by omitting important facts has violated one of the fundamental laws of history, has not paid very strict regard to the other law, which requires a close observance of truth in describing those other facts that he has thought worthy to be retained: and this suspicion derives additional weight from the character of Eusebius, who betrays himself in every part of his work as an unscrupulous partisan rather than an impartial historian, and yet makes it evident in every page of his history, that he was less influenced by superstition than any other writer of those times.

With these cautions as to the character of Eusebius, the weight to be attached to the minor writings contained in the last chapter, may be safely left to the judgement of the reader.

We may place in the THIRD CLASS of early authorities the Apologists, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Tatian, Theophilus and Hermias; none of these give us clear testimonies that the books of the New Testament, and more especially the Epistles, existed in their present form until the latter part of the second century in which themselves lived. Theophilus of Antioch does indeed quote the words which form the first verse of St John's Gospel, and quotes them as proceeding from St John, but when Theophilus wrote that, the second century was hastening to its end; for the 'writing' of Theophilus addressed to Autolycus brings events down to A.D. 169, and therefore was penned after that year.

Hermias also, who certainly did not live before Theophilus, quotes St Paul as writing to the Corinthians words which still appear in our book (I COR. iii, 19), but his Benedictine editor thinks Hermias may be ascribed as justly to the third as to the second century; and I am more than inclined to assign him to a later date, seeing that his style is too brave and triumphant in his censures of the old religion to have been penned when Christianity was still struggling against the heathen and not yet fixed upon a comparatively sure basis as afterwards.

The larger writings of Irenæus and Origen speak of the books contained in our New Testament much more briefly than would have been the case if those books had been extant an hundred and twenty years throughout Christendom, as is asserted by those who ascribe not only the teaching and the relation of facts, but also the very Greek words to the apostolic writers, who being Hebrews cannot be shown to have been acquainted with Greek at all. The few passages of these later writers, in which the apostles are named, will be reviewed, when we come to speak of each of those apostles in a future chapter.

A FOURTH CLASS of writings consists of Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Revelations, of all which many specimens remain. These have mostly been printed, and will hereafter be adduced in illustration of the few memorials remaining of the Apostles to whom they are ascribed. The most important of them are these which follow.

1. The Gospel according to the Hebrews, the remaining fragments of which have lately been published and seem to prove that our existing Gospel of St Matthew is founded in a great degree upon the lost work so often named by the early writers.
2. The Gospel of the Nazarenes ; and 3. The Gospel of the Ebionites, are perhaps identical wholly or in part with the Gospel of the Hebrews.
4. Gospel according to Peter.
5. Gospel according to the Egyptians.
6. Traditions of Matthias.
7. The Preaching of Peter and Paul.
8. Acts of Peter and Paul.
9. Revelation of Peter.
10. Doctrines of the Apostles.
11. The two ways or the Judgement of Peter.

Besides these, traces have been found in ancient authors of nearly a hundred others, of various kinds, Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Revelations : and some of these are named by Justin Martyr, Papias, and others, who take no notice of the canonical books. From which it has reasonably been inferred that certain of these writings are even older than our books of the New Testament. Wherever this can be traced, the name of apocryphal is hardly assigned to them with justice. Uncanonical is the more appropriate name, and does not prevent their testimony from being used about facts connected with the history of those times.

Another class of writings still remain which may here be noticed, not only on account of their bulk, but of the doubts which have always been entertained down to the present day about the period at which they were written and the source from which they were derived. These are: I. The SIBYLLINE ORACLES. II. The Clementine Recognitions. III. The Clementine Homilies. IV. The Apostolical Constitutions. Each of these works will require to be separately examined; for they have all, or at least portions of them, been thought to owe their origin to the latter part of the second century, when the whole of the Roman Empire was deluged with a mass of fanatical and superstitious writings unequalled in the history of mankind.

Sibylline Oracles.

It is now the opinion of critics that the poetical writings which pass under the name of Sibylline* Oracles were written or interpolated at the very beginning of the second century of the Christian era. It is indeed difficult to gainsay this opinion, for Justin Martyr, who wrote about the year 150, and who mentions none of the books of the New Testament or their writers, distinctly names the Sibyls as prophetesses among the Greeks and other nations. But Josephus, (Ant. i, 6) who wrote 80 years before Justin Martyr, quotes from the Sibyl verses which still appear in the third book (verse 97) of the Oracles as we now have them, and it must be acknowledged that those verses, which speak of the tower of Babel as built, whilst men spoke the same language, to enable them to mount to heaven, were at all events earlier than the Christian era, and drawn most likely from the ancient Jewish Scriptures. Not only, however, Josephus, but Abydenus, Alexander Polyhistor, Theophilus, and Aristagoras quote many verses from these same books. One extract translated, with some attempt at metre, almost word for word, will be enough to show that the Sibylline Oracles were extended and adapted to the needs of those who at an early date after the crucifixion tried to prop up Christianity by the authority of these spurious and feeble writings.

* The only complete edition of this work, in 2 volumes, bears this title: Oracula Sibyllina, textu ad codices manuscriptos recognito, Maianis supplementis aucto; cum Castalionis versione metrica innumeris pæne locis emendata, et ubi opus fuit suppleta; commentario perpetuo, excursibus et indicibus; curante C. ALEXANDRE, Parisiis apud Firmin Didot fratres, via Jacobi 56, MDCCCXLI.

Th' Almighty spake, "My son, let us two make
A mortal race, moulded from our own image.
I now by hand, and thou by word hereafter,
A common work give forth in our own form.
He, mindful of this will, shall come to judgement,
His copied likeness bring to a pure virgin,
Illume with water too through priestly hands,
Do all things by his word, heal all disease,
Calm the winds by his word, quell the sea raging
Beneath his feet, tread it in peace by faith;
And from five loaves and a fish of the sea
Shall in the desert feed five thousand men,
And taking all the fragments which remain
Shall fill twelve baskets to the hope of peoples." O.S. viii, 265.

If this prophecy was written, as it professes, before the events to which it refers so plainly, the gift of prophecy was not limited to the religion of the Jews, which we all recognize to be true, but belonged also to the pagan religions, of which the Sibyls were the ministers, and which we all believe to be false.*

Clementine Recognitions.

The 'Clementine Recognitions' is a work of which the English translation† occupies about 330 ordinarily printed octavo pages. The work has come down to us in a Latin translation only, made by the celebrated Rufinus, a priest of Aquileia, who lived about the middle or end of the fourth century, and wrote a large number of translations from the Greek besides original works.

Rufinus dedicates his translation to Bishop Gaudentius, and tells us in his dedication that Clement, whom he names as author of the Greek original, addressed it to James the brother of our Lord. This of course implies that Rufinus looked upon the James, who is called the first bishop of Jerusalem, as one of the brothers of Jesus who bore that name, and not as the son of Alpheus who was so called, and who is in modern times considered more likely to have been set at the head of the church in Jerusalem. It is impossible now to decide this question, and it is not important that it should be decided.

* See also Christian Records for further remarks on these writings.

† Forming a volume of the Antenicene Library, entitled 'The writings of Tatian and Theophilus; and the Clementine Recognitions, translated by Rev. B. P. Pratten, Rev. Marcus Dods, A.M., and Rev. Thomas Smith, D.D. 8vo. Edinburgh, 1867.'

The work, with which we are now dealing, is accompanied by two shorter writings, treating very briefly on the same subject, namely, the acts and travels of St Peter, chiefly in discussion with Simon Magus, who is represented as a magician and deceiver, by whom many persons were perverted from the Christian faith. The discussion is related by Clement, who first describes his own early life and his conversion to Christianity, and then relates at much length the arguments both of Peter and of Simon Magus. The scene is laid mostly at Cæsarea, where Zaccheus, who in the gospels climbed the fig-tree, is, by a bold flight of the imagination, appointed to be the first bishop, with twelve presbyters and four deacons as his supporters. But Simon soon afterwards removed to Rome, and Peter is said to have followed him thither, and there has always been an obscure tradition, fostered by Italian Romanists, that Peter there was associated with Paul, and that the two having become joint founders of the Roman Church, were put to death in the reign and by the command of Nero. This, however, is a mere legend, unworthy of notice, and refuted by another tradition, equally untrue in its details, although exceedingly probable in its groundwork, that the Simon whom Peter followed in support of the true faith was rather St Paul himself, who is known, by his own declaration in the Epistle to the Galatians, to have been antagonistic to St Peter and to all the apostles who adhered to the semi-Judaic doctrines maintained by the Church of Jerusalem. This theory, although very uncertain like the other, as matter of fact, is strongly confirmed by the second narrative, ascribed to St Clement of Rome—The Clementine Homilies.

Clementine Homilies.

The Clementine Homilies treat of the same subjects as the Recognitions. Clement of Rome appears as their author, but it is the general opinion of critics, that both of these works are a kind of romance, in which real personages appear as the actors, but the events recorded therein are fictions, based upon a small groundwork of fact. The work, of which we are now speaking, is extant in the original Greek, and is introduced to the reader by two Epistles, one in which Peter addresses to James, "the lord and bishop of the Holy Church," certain admonitions about his own preaching, and the other, in which Clement is made to address the same James in the following manner.

Clement to James the lord, and bishop of bishops, who rules Jerusalem, the holy church of the Hebrews, and the churches everywhere excellently founded by the providence of God, with the elders and deacons, and the rest of the brethren, peace be always.

The subject of these homilies, twenty in number, is very miscellaneous; they treat of the early life of Clement, and of St Peter, whose controversy with Simon Magus is thought to veil the antagonism between Peter and Paul, as pointed out under our notice of the Recognitions, and already shadowed out in the Acts of the Apostles and St Paul's Epistles. A short notice of the third work which remains, connected with St Clement of Rome, will be sufficient to prepare the way for further mention of it hereafter.

Apostolical Constitutions.

This work is more fully entitled Constitutions of the Holy Apostles by Clement bishop and citizen of Rome. It is addressed in the manner of an Epistle.

The apostles, and elders to all those who from among the Gentiles have believed in the Lord Jesus Christ; grace and peace from Almighty God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, be multiplied unto you in the acknowledgement of him. [*Ap. Con.* i, 1.]

The genuineness and authenticity of this work, as of the two preceding ones, were of course accepted for many hundred years by the Roman Catholic Church. It was highly desirable that a series of laws and rules, so fully recognizing the three orders of the Church, together with the pains and penalties to which the laity were subject for disobedience to their clerical superiors, should be traced up to the very times of the apostles. But at the Reformation these claims were questioned, examined, and repudiated. The Scriptures themselves did not present a view of things in harmony with the pretentions which these apostolical constitutions set forth, and the constitutions themselves, almost as bulky as the whole of the New Testament, anticipated many theories which many hundred years later were set up by the Church, no longer infantine as in the days of the apostles, but triumphant over all opposition, and, as has been thought by some in modern times, despotic in its authority, and tyrannical in the exercise of that authority over the ignorant and humbled laity. And yet not many

years ago it was maintained by Whiston, in his "Primitive Christianity Revived," that

These sacred Christian laws or constitutions were delivered at Jerusalem, and in Mount Sion, by our Saviour to the eleven apostles there assembled after his resurrection.

And it is still more wonderful that the same writer should assert them to be "the most sacred of the canonical books of the New Testament." At the present time it is improbable that these writings will be accepted by any even the most bigoted ecclesiastics; and others, who ignorant of the subject may wish to form an opinion of them, will hardly accept as authentic the following which are found in the eighth and last book of the work.

§ 53. If any bishop or presbyter or deacon does not on festival days partake of flesh or wine, let him be deprived, "as having a seared conscience," and becoming a cause of scandal to many.

§ 69. If any bishop, or presbyter, or deacon, or reader, or singer, does not fast the fast of forty days, or the fourth day of the week, and the day of the preparation, let him be deprived, except he be hindered by weakness of body. But if he be one of the laity, let him be suspended.

§ 75. Do not receive an heretic in a testimony against a bishop; nor a Christian, if he be the only one. For the law says, "In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established."

§ 79. If any one hath a demon,* let him not be made one of the clergy. Nay, let him not pray with the faithful; but when he is cleansed, let him be received; and, if he be worthy, let him be ordained.

---

* In the next chapter will be found a notice of the demonology which formed part of the Jewish social creed.

CHAPTER IX.

Superstition—Magic—Visions.

It has been said by some writers that the age, in which Christianity appeared among mankind, is strongly marked by contempt of the forms and distrust in the doctrines of the existing religion. This has been sometimes classed among the powerful reasons why the ancient heathenism yielded its place so widely and so speedily to the new doctrines. But it is equally true that the greater obligations, which the belief in a higher power entails on mankind, have failed to crush the small superstitions which attach themselves to different places and bear unlimited sway over the minds of rustic people. Nor is it over uneducated minds only that superstition has this power: for even highly educated persons, especially women, in the present day, do not hesitate to acknowledge fears arising from a sentiment of something supernatural, from which they apprehend danger or inconvenience. Even among those who have thrown off all belief in a divine being, this influence is still felt. The mere fact of its being dark, the unexpected presence of death, and many such agents are frequently found to create a reaction in minds that are generally very strong. There is, indeed, implanted in the nature of man a tendency to the supernatural, which even scepticism does not extinguish. It is not improbable that the forms which belong to all religions, and which have been pushed to a great length at some periods of Christianity itself, and possibly even at the present day, are due to the feeling of danger from supernatural beings, which drives men to seek protection by means lying beyond the range of their daily life and experience. It has indeed been argued by some of the ancient philosophers that these local superstitions with their forms and ceremonies were the earliest of all that ever have been known among mankind, and gave birth to the polytheism with all the more ornate ceremonies and worship which passed successively through Assyria, Egypt, Greece, and Rome, until shaken by a growing distrust in their efficacy, and by the appearance of a better creed, which substituted a belief in one

God, and destroyed, although with much opposition from its votaries, the ancient Pantheon.

We can hardly doubt that monotheism had been largely introduced, even before the Christian era, by the Jews into the various countries, wherever that commercial and enterprising people had penetrated. But facts such as these here enumerated were wholly unable to suppress the arts of divination and necromancy, together with the use of amulets, and generally the whole magical science, under which name all the others may be classed. It would not be difficult, were the occasion appropriate, to enlarge widely on this subject, and to produce a mass of evidence calculated to check the pride of intellect, which it is so natural to mankind to cherish. It is not an encouraging fact that the arts of prophecy, of divination, and of magic generally, were most widely spread abroad and practised among the people, at the same time that the upper classes had long given up all belief in the truth, whilst they still maintained the usefulness, of the old religion. The first teachers of Christianity therefore had to meet a great obstacle to their success in the belief which the populace in many towns held, that the preachers of the new doctrines were magicians. We read in our canonical books several instances of alleged sorcery, such as may have deterred men from embracing all the truths of the Gospel, from a natural conviction that the magical powers, which impostors professed to exercise, and which were accepted by the ignorant people, really proceeded from supernatural power; and this belief would raise in their minds a corresponding conviction that the miracles wrought by the apostles might be attributed to like powers, but only greater than those possessed by the wonder-workers whom they had been used to see among them.

The origin of religion has been often, perhaps reasonably, ascribed to the fear of danger from unseen beings, as has been already said, and the Latin poet has expressed this in those words of his poem which have become so famous—*Primus in orbe deos fecit timor.* But the Jews from the earliest times, followed by every Christian and Mahometan nation to the present day, have more worthily referred it to Revelations made from time to time by a Supreme Being who created and still upholds the world and all that is therein.

The magical art, however, which perhaps was earlier than any religion with which we are acquainted, is lost in remote antiquity.

The first practice of it is found in the earliest book of the Old Testament. The spirit of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, was troubled by two dreams, which the magicians of Egypt, summoned by the king, were unable to explain (GEN. xli, 8). The dreams were interpreted by the Hebrew captive Joseph, who consequently was raised to be Pharaoh's prime minister, and set to manage all the affairs of Egypt. When four hundred years had passed away, the magicians of Egypt were still held in esteem at the court of the Egyptian king. The rod of Aaron was cast down and became a serpent. This was done at the request of the king himself, as a sign of their commission (Ex. vii, 11), but Pharaoh sent for the sorcerers and the magicians, and they also "did the same with their enchantments;" they threw down their rods, which in like manner became serpents; but it is expressly stated that Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods. When, however, we read that Moses was skilled in all the arts and learning of the Egyptians, it may be inferred, that both he and Aaron had made themselves, by their education, quite competent to play their part in such scenes as were enacted politically before King Pharaoh.

The witch of Endor too may be named in the enumeration of those who professed to exercise unworldly arts, and she did it, as we might suppose from the scriptural narrative, openly, notwithstanding that the law did not suffer a witch to live (Ex. xxii, 18). Nor need we be deterred by the wonderful display of power with which Moses, Aaron, and the magicians of Egypt, as well as the witch of Endor, astonished the eyes and the minds of those who witnessed them; for both in Egypt, and in almost all the countries of the East, the same arts are daily practised; the charmers of serpents teach those reptiles in certain cases alternately to become rigid and again to take their original form: and a result similar to the appearance of Samuel before the Israelitish king is recorded as having been produced more or less distinctly, in modern times, by the magic mirror.

Even kings and queens, either fraudulently or in superstition, practised the art of magic. The witchcrafts of Jezebel are named together with her whoredoms (II KINGS, ix, 22); and in the latter half of the monarchy, Manasseh king of Judah furnished a flagrant example of idolatry, superstition, and witchcraft. He not only worshiped the host of heaven, and built altars to Baal and to other deities, who at all events were recognized by the people generally as deities,

but he condescended to those lower arts of sorcery to which our attention is now directed.

He caused his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnom: also he observed times, and used enchantments, and used witchcraft, and dealt with a familiar spirit; he wrought much evil in the sight of the Lord to provoke him to anger. [II CHRON. xxxiii, 6.]

In pursuing the stream of Jewish history, we come to the prophet Daniel, who lived in a much later age than those already named, and at a time when a great change was taking place in the fortunes of his nation. He was among the captives carried away to Babylon, and placed by King Nebuchadnezzar among the eunuchs of the place, because probably he was himself reduced to the same state as those with whom he was associated, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Let us see what is said of them in the book of Daniel.

As for these four children, God gave them knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom; and Daniel had understanding in all visions. [DAN. i, 20.]

A hasty reader of the chapter where these words occur, might think that this knowledge was gained by the four young Jews from instruction given them in the palace of the king. But a preceding verse of the same chapter shows us that this was not wholly so.

The king spake unto Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring *certain* of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the princes, children in whom there was no blemish, but well-favoured, and skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace, and whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans. [i, 3-4.]

It was not then *all* learning, but principally a knowledge of the Chaldean language, which these young men had to be taught in Babylon: they already were skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge; and we are told, a few verses further on, what was the opinion formed of them by the king, when they were at the end of three years introduced to his presence that he might commune with them.

In all matters of wisdom and understanding, that the king

enquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm. [i, 20.]

Nor is it only in connection with Daniel that we read of magic as forming part of what passed for wisdom and learning in those days. At no great distance of time from the date of Daniel, the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah that he should warn his countrymen, as well as the various nations by which they were surrounded, not to oppose the Babylonians, for that the Lord had given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar.

> Therefore hearken not ye to your prophets, nor to your diviners, nor to your dreamers, nor to your enchanters, nor to your sorcerers, which speak unto you, saying, "Ye shall not serve the king of Babylon." [JEREMIAH, XXVII, 9.]

It is probable that these references to the art of magic, although so fully set forth, have failed to attract the notice even of those who have made a constant study of Bible history; and they may have failed to detect in another instance of the same kind the real character of a man who is exhibited to us in the beginning of the Israelitish history.

Balaam the son of Beor was sent for by Balak the son of Zippor, king of Moab, to exercise magical arts against the children of Israel, when all human means seemed unable to check their march. The recital of events which followed this invitation, is fully unfolded in the book of Numbers (xxii-xxiv). The messengers, who were elders of the Midianites, a neighbouring tribe, to whom Balak being himself perhaps a Midianite had appealed for help, bore with them the rewards of divination in their hands. What these were we are not told, but we may be sure that they were something of value, such as would tempt the cupidity of a diviner, as indeed they did tempt the cupidity of the son of Beor. Lest it might seem strange to place the soothsayer Balaam on the same footing as the others whom we have already named, let it not be forgotten that those others were either Israelites or closely connected with that nation; whereas Balaam was a Moabite, and we have no witness beyond the book of Numbers that Moab was acquainted with the name of Jehovah, the God of Israel.

We may ascribe the divine communication, which passed before Balaam started to meet King Balak, to that custom which is found in the Hebrew writings, of dramatizing all the religious events, and introducing the Almighty himself

as personally arguing with his people. Such intercourse with God might be sufficiently effected by mental communication, especially if God, as we hold him to be, is a spirit; and in that case poetry may easily extend its province to the utmost flight of the human imagination.

If this be accepted as a reasonable explanation of the difficulty which arises from finding in our Bible an argument carried on between God and a Gentile, if not heathen, diviner, we may be excused for suggesting that the spirit of poetry may be detected alongside with the reality of fact in the dialogue which is related between the soothsayer and the ass on which he rode.

The arts, of which we are now speaking, continued without much variation down to the latest days of Judaism. Sorceries and enchantments are spoken of by Isaiah (xlvii, 9-12); and Malachi (iii, 5), the last of the Hebrew prophets, classes sorceries with adulterers, false swearers, and others who oppress the stranger, the fatherless, or the widow, and defraud the hired servant of his wages.

The apocrypha of the Old Testament, especially the book of Tobit, would furnish us with further instances of magical practice, if they were required. But it will be sufficient to pass on to those which are furnished by the New Testament and other books written some time after the beginning of the Christian era.

It is only in the Acts of the Apostles that we find mention of persons actually exercising sorcery, witchcraft, or any similar arts. Nor is it to be wondered at that the multitude, who believed in all these magical and supernatural powers, should have ascribed to such agency the cures and other wonderful works performed by the apostles. Even our Lord himself was not safe from accusation. "Thou hast a devil," was an easy mode of explaining a miracle similar to wonders of the same kind which they thought they had witnessed at the hands of others. The devil in this case was one of the demons which were supposed to attach themselves to individuals and to aid them in performing works beyond the reach of ordinary human nature. The people had not hesitated to accuse Jesus of drawing aid from such an attendant genius, and we have full accounts of the same superstition among the Greeks in the case of Socrates, who lived four hundred years before.

The book which we name the Acts of the Apostles records many supernatural works done by Peter, John,

Paul, and others, having for their object the propagation of the Gospel as well as the healing of sick persons, and other benefits to all mankind. In discharging these duties, they occasionally fall in with others claiming similar powers, but exercising them invariably for the glorification or pecuniary benefit of themselves.

The first of these named in the Acts is Simon Magus, Simon the Magician, whose name shows the class of men to which he belonged. He is brought to our notice first in the city of Samaria, where

> He used sorcery, and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one. To whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, "This man is the great power of God." And to him they had regard, because that of long time he had bewitched them with sorceries. [Acts, viii, 9-11.]

This man, however, when he saw the superior power of Philip the deacon, was baptized, together with others, both men and women, and continued with Philip, "and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done."

When Peter came down to Samaria, this same Simon offered him money, that he might have the power which the apostles had of conferring the Holy Ghost on all that he should lay his hands upon. The censure of the apostle was followed by the profession of repentance from the delinquent; but the sincerity of his repentance is hardly consistent with the series of events which are said to have happened later. The most singular and important result of his appearance in the apostolic narrative, is that his name has been absurdly made the basis of an ecclesiastical offence with which the original crime of the Magus has nothing at all in common. Simon Magus will again appear in a future page in connection with St Peter, and an ancient work, where both of them are made to play a part, and which is of so obscure an origin and character that some critics have even doubted whether such a man as Simon Magus ever existed.

But whilst he is thus described in relation to St Peter, another magician, Elymas Barjesus, or the son of Jesus, is named as an antagonist to Barnabas and Saul, who from this time is called Paul. These two were preaching as missionaries in Cyprus at Paphos, where

> They found a certain sorcerer, a false prophet, a Jew, whose name was Bar-jesus; which was with the deputy of the country,

Sergius Paulus, a prudent man, who called for Barnabas and Saul, and desired to hear the word of God. But Elymas the sorcerer (for so is his name by interpretation) withstood them, seeking to turn away the deputy from the faith. Then Saul (who also is called Paul), filled with the Holy Ghost, set his eyes on him, and said, "O full of all subtilty and all mischief, *thou* child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord? And now, behold, the hand of the Lord *is* upon thee, and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness; and he went about, seeking some to lead him by the hand." [Acts, xiii, 6-11.]

Besides these two sorcerers, who clearly belong to the same class as those who have been named as living under the ancient Israelitish commonwealth, we have a few cases of inferior agency, showing that the practice of these arts reached to every class of the people then, as it does now, only modified by the superior knowledge which we possess, and which was not possessed by them.

We set aside the signs and wonders performed by the apostles themselves, not distinctly specified in the Acts (ii, 43; v, 12); but may cite the case of a certain damsel "possessed of a spirit of divination," "which brought her masters much gain by soothsaying" (xvi, 16).

Here we recognize the agency of a demon as before referred to; for St Paul, having compassion on the deluded woman who was made to delude others, said to the spirit, "I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her;" and he came out the same hour.

Setting aside for the moment as forming part of the Christian, not of the heathen, community, the four daughters of Philip "which did prophesy" (Acts, xxi, 9), we meet with a singular incident showing how the wonder-workers of the day, witnessing the superior miracles of the apostles, sought to unite themselves to the new sect, by employing, as they fancied, the same charm which they saw to be so powerful in the hands of the apostles. The story is most singular, and may be here cited.

Certain of the vagabond Jews, exorcists, took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, "We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth." And there were seven sons of *one* Scæva, a Jew and chief of the priests, which did so. And the evil spirit answered and said, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are ye?" And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and

overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded. [Acts, xix, 13.]

The sorceries, enchantments, witchcrafts, and other arts, all alike, and probably the same, except in name, as one another, exhibited in the extracts which we have made, are again enumerated in the Revelation of St John, where they are classed with murder, theft, and lies, and are threatened with condign punishment in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone. (Rev. ix, 21; xviii, 23; xxi, 8; xxii, 15.)

Whilst, however, these fraudulent doings maintained their ground among the Jews, it is not to be supposed that the Gentiles, to use a common term, had nothing of the kind going on among them. The whole of Asia has always abounded with tales of demonology and witchcraft; they were indeed so prevalent everywhere, that even the most intelligent monarchs found it expedient to deal lightly with those who practised these arts, whilst on the other hand some of the most tyrannical sovereigns deemed it their duty to suppress them. They are known by the more refined names of mathematicians or Chaldæans under nearly all the early Roman emperors, and in the reign of Tiberius were expelled by a decree of the Senate from the whole of Italy. (Tac. *An.* ii, 32.) One of these malefactors was thrown from the rock, and a second met with a more fearful punishment, being put to death *more antiquo*, "in the ancient manner." Later on still, in the reign of Claudius, another decree was passed against them. Furius Scribonianus had been driven into exile, on the suspicion of having consulted Chaldæans about the death of the emperor. The banished man did not long survive his exile; and some said that his death was brought on by poison. The decree against the mathematicians perhaps was due to this among other similar crimes: but Tacitus (*An.* xii, 52) tells us that the decree was *atrox et irritum*, harsh and ineffectual. The hold which the criminals had got over the minds of men was too great to be broken by these decrees: no laws, however harsh, will control men who have been bred up in a society where superstition, with its accompaniments, sorcery, soothsaying and magic, have long held sway. It would take us too far from our present subject to enlarge upon the practice of magic among the ancients. A flagrant illustration of the extent to which it prevailed may be read in the Golden Ass of Appuleius, the point of which is that the hero of the tale is turned by enchantment into the form of an ass, and as such goes

through a series of adventures, some of which, written in Latin, the boldest interpreter has hesitated to translate into English.

In naming Appuleius we have passed on to the second century, in which he is supposed to have lived. Let us then return to the order of our narrative.

In the year 70 Vespasian, after his campaigns in Asia, ascended the imperial throne. It is well known that all manner of cabals were carried on both in Rome and also in the East, where Vespasian then was. Every mode of foreseeing what would happen was practised by those who were interested in excluding Vespasian or admitting him to the throne vacated by the death of Vitellius. The best account of the matter as regards our subject may be quoted from the original historian of those days, exhibiting a view of supernatural pretensions, which has been quoted by some in comparison and by others in contrast to the miracles described in our Scriptures. For the aim proposed by those who supported the supernatural agency which was then employed, was to benefit the patients rather than merely to display power, and we may believe that no other than humane and beneficent measures would be in harmony with the benevolent views of the emperor Vespasian.

During those months in which Vespasian was awaiting at Alexandria, in the days suited for summer breezes, and a settled state of the sea, many miracles happened, by which the favour of heaven, and a certain inclination of the Numidians, was shown towards Vespasian. A man of the common people at Alexandria, known by a disease of his eyes, falls down at his knees, asking with a groan to be cured of his blindness; *this was* by advice of the god Serapis, whom that race given up to superstition worship before all others; and he prayed the prince that he would deign to sprinkle his cheeks and the balls of his eyes with spittle from his mouth. Another man, with a diseased hand, by advice of the same god, entreated that it might be trodden on by the foot and step of Cæsar. Vespasian at first made a joke of them and treated them with contempt, but when they still pressed, he began at one time to fear the imputation of vanity, and at another to be led, by the entreaty of the men themselves and the words of his flatterers, to entertain hope. At last he orders that an opinion should be given by the physicians, whether such blindness and infirmity might be cured by human means. The physicians gave various opinions—that the power of sight was not destroyed in one of the men, and would return if the obstacles were driven out, and that in the other the limbs had gone out wrongly, and might be

restored, if a healing power were applied; that this perhaps was agreeable to the gods, and that the prince had been chosen with the divine aid; and lastly, that the credit of a remedy that was effected would be the prince's, whilst the ridicule of it, if it failed, would fall upon the wretched men themselves. Vespasian therefore, thinking everything possible to his good fortune, and nothing afterwards incredible, with cheerful countenance does what he is bidden, amid the excitement of the by-standers. The hand was at once restored to its use, and the light of day shone on the blind man. Those who were present still speak of both *cures*, when there is no gain to be got by falsehood. [Tac. *Hist.* iv, 81.]

This story, related by the greatest historian of that age, can hardly be refuted by any direct line of argument, which is not applicable to the miracles performed by the apostles: but it will be easily refuted by the good sense of mankind, and will be believed by few, who nevertheless give unfeigned adhesion to all that is related in the book of the Christian Scriptures.

Visions.

From the Magical Art as illustrated in the foregoing instances, our attention is invited to the Visions which are recorded in various parts of the Bible as having great influence on the religion and politics of those to whom they were communicated. With visions we generally connect the idea of dreams, so much so that it may fairly be doubted whether any vision is real that is recorded as having been presented to the senses in any other way than in a dream. Nor does this inference flow from any very definite and certain knowledge that we possess on the nature of dreams or the way in which their action is carried on. It would appear that whatever is heard by the ear in the daytime, when we are awake, may somehow or other act upon us when asleep, with so much effect as to produce the conviction that we have really heard those sounds, although none have come to us from without. In the same way we fancy that we see in our sleep forms as vividly as if we were awake, and as if those forms were actually before our eyes. We may call these appearances creations of the mind, if we will, or we may ascribe them to various modes of action, according to the theories at which various enquirers have arrived. But our forefathers were less scientific than we on this and other kindred subjects. They ascribe to a

personal revelation, or at all events to a spiritual apparition, many things which probably sprung from their inward selves, in consequence of something which had been placed before their senses or their thoughts in previous wakeful hours. It will, I believe, be no loss of time to review the principal visions found in our Scriptures, premising that in an historical narrative like the present it is essential to set aside all supernatural and doctrinal views, which are always found to bias the minds of those who would otherwise draw natural conclusions in conformity with the premises placed before them.

In most of the visions related in the Bible, sleep is found to be the basis. The Almighty causes a "deep sleep to fall upon Adam," as we read in the book of Genesis (ii, 21); and from this is derived the creation of Eve his wife. The same words are used in the case of Abraham, to whom "the word of the Lord came in a vision," and he was told of the high estate to which his family would attain. A token is given to Abraham, the nature of which is somewhat obscure, apparently a variety of victims are prepared, but no sacrifice or other result follows.

> And when the sun was down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and, lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him. [GEN. xv, 1-12.]

This is followed by an enumeration of the various calamities which should befal his posterity, until they should finally obtain possession of the land in which they were then strangers.

The connection between sleep and visions is clearly pointed out in the book of Job.

> In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, fear came upon me, and trembling, which made all my bones to shake. Then a spirit passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up. It stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image was before mine eyes, *there was* silence, and I heard a voice. [iv. 13-16.]

We are not debarred from citing this passage to illustrate our present subject by the fact that the book of Job is a tale of the imagination rather than a history. It has been a common practice in every age to make use of fictitious narratives in order to teach morality and religion; and it was the opinion of the great Italian poet that even truth

derived much of its success from the "soft verses"* and attractive style in which it was presented to the reader.

Not only, however, the book of Job, but several others of those which are contained in the Hebrew Canon, seem to present features appertaining to poetry rather than to that strictness of historical accuracy which is justly required of modern writers. The accounts which we have of Balaam are of this class, and we may again cite him as one to whom visions were familiar. His mission to Balak ended unfavourably to himself, but in what sense are we to interpret his parting words, in which he decrsibes a vision of God himself?

He took up his parable, and said, "Balaam the son of Beor hath said, and the man whose eyes are open hath said: he hath said which heard the words of God, which saw the vision of the Almighty, falling *into a trance*, but having his eyes open."

Then follows the blessing which Balaam pronounced upon Israel instead of the curse which he had been invited by Balak expressly to pronounce.

Such visions as that do not occur in the case of all the prophets, or at least are not so fully described as in the case of Balaam. Still they are so often spoken of throughout the whole of Israelitish history that they prepare us for more accurately understanding those which occur in the narratives of the New Testament. Thus Ezekiel (i, 1) tells us that "the heavens were opened, and I saw visions of God." We have "the vision of Obadiah" (i, 1); the "Book of the Vision of Nahum the Elkoshite" (i, 1). Daniel "had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed" (vii, 1). To the same class belongs the communication made to Samuel when as a little boy he ministered unto the Lord before Eli (I Sam. iii, 1). The historian tells us that "the word of the Lord was precious in those days, there was no open vision." We are by these words reminded of the distinction which Homer makes between *onar*, a vision by dream, and *hupar*, an actual appearance; and some knowledge of these things is necessary to us, if we would wish to understand the many passages of the Bible in which these visions are named. We may admit them to be worthy of notice

---

* Sai che la corre il mondo, ove più versi
Di sue dolcezze il lusinghier Parnaso;
E che il vero condito in molli versi
I più schivi allettando a persuaso.

Tasso, *G.L.* i, 3.

and as factors in the important problems which we have to solve, although we may have long since abandoned all belief in the reality or the probability, and even the possibility, of their occurrence.

We have plain statements in many books of the Bible, that not only good but evil was allowed to proceed from God to man, by means of spirits, whatever the nature of those mysterious beings may have been. We read of King Saul after his offence in the matter of Agag and the Amalekitish nation.

> The Spirit of the Lord departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord troubled him.
>
> And Saul's servant said unto him, "Behold now, an evil spirit from God troubleth thee." [I SAM. xvi, 14-15.]

A more fully developed description of such agency of spirits is found in the vision made to Micaiah, who relates it to King Ahab before he goes down to Ramoth-Gilead to the battle, in which he was slain. The story is well known: the other prophets had predicted Ahab's success: Micaiah speaks as follows.

> Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, 'Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead?' And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood before the Lord, and said, 'I will persuade him.' And the Lord said unto him, 'Wherewith?' and he said, 'I will go forth, and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets.' And he [*God*] said, 'Thou shalt persuade *him*, and prevail also: go forth, and do so.' Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee. [I KINGS, xxii, 19-23.]

The last instance of spiritual agency which I shall produce will be from the book of Job, already quoted. It is here that we have the only clear use of the word Satan as equivalent to the Devil; for in two other passages (I CHRON. xxi, 1; PSALM cix, 6) the word may be equally well translated an adversary, as indeed is stated in a marginal note of our authorized version. But in Job we have a full account of a scene in which Satan appears, evidently as the Devil, in presence and in defiance of the Almighty; and the marvelous circumstances of the interview are such as to

strain the belief of those who look upon the narrative as simply historical.

Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them. And the Lord said unto Satan, "Whence comest thou?" Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, "From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it."

God then calls the attention of Satan to righteous Job, and Satan, evidently the representative among the Jews of the Persian Ahrimanes the author of evil, taunts Jehovah, Ormuz the author of good, with the selfish motives which underlie the righteousness of Job.

Hast not thou made an hedge about him and about his house, and about all that he hath on every side? Thou hast blessed the work of his hands, and his substance is increased in the land. But put forth thy hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face.

The reply to this challenge completes the allegory, but can in no wise be accepted, any more than the appearance of Satan from the first, as a literal record of what has ever happened between God and man from the first moment of creation to the present time.

And the Lord said unto Satan, 'Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thine hand.' [i, 12.]

The calamities which befel Job as the result of this interview between Satan and the Almighty, reduced Job to a state almost as bad as any to which a man is liable, and yet "he sinned not, nor charged God foolishly." But there was still worse in store for him. There was again a day when the court of heaven was open, and Satan again appeared before the Almighty. He was charged with the failure of his machinations, and he challenged a further trial of Job's faith.

Satan answered the Lord and said, 'Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life. But put forth thine hand now, and he will curse thee to thy face.' And the Lord said unto Satan, 'Behold, he is in thine hand, but save his life.' [ii, 4-6.]

This narrative, together with the preceding, well point out the belief in dreams, visions, and spiritual appearances which from the earliest times prevailed among the Israelites.

The details of Job's history have been dwelt upon at greater length than was needful to prove that simple fact: they are too marvellous to be simply quoted for the maintenance of any cause, without the addition of some remarks which may enable a reader to understand more clearly the true character of the book which he is reading.

Proceeding then to enquire how the belief in visions and similar action of magicians may have continued down to the beginning of the Christian era, we are not surprised to find very scanty notice of it in the four gospels. The first vision recorded therein was the appearance of the angel to Zacharias in the temple, which could hardly have been in a dream, for Zacharias was officiating in the order of his course, and the angel came to announce to him the birth of a son. This then would seem to have been a real appearance of the class which Homer describes by the name of *hupar*, and when Zacharias came out from the temple, according to St Luke (i, 22), he could not speak unto the people, and they perceived that he had seen a vision.

The similar appearance of an angel to the Virgin Mary recorded in St Luke's Gospel, does not differ in character from that which was made to Zacharias. It was in the sixth month after it:

> The angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. [i, 26.]

Not of the same kind, however, was the divine communication made to Joseph. The angel of the Lord, we are told by St Matthew (i, 20), "appeared to him in a dream." In the same way Joseph and Mary "were warned of God in a dream" to flee into Egypt and also, again in a dream, not to return into the dominions of Herod. (MATT. ii, 12-22.)

The wife of Pilate also is stated by St Matthew to have been visited in a similar manner.

> When he [*Pilate*] was set down on the judgement seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, "Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him." [xxvii, 19.]

It is unnecessary to do more than allude to the appearance of angels which came to Jesus at various times, or of those who were seen by the women after his resurrection. It was no longer the belief of the times that God himself

might appear to men; the divine communications were made through the ministry of angels, a name derived by imitation from the Greek *angeloi*, messengers—one of that class of words which have served to give a specific and foreign meaning to a large number of official titles that have entered into the phraseology of the Christian Church. The term angels came from the Greeks, but the theory of them, as also the use of the name Satan, was either introduced or at all events much intensified by intercourse with the Babylonians during the seventy years' captivity among that people.

But we may now proceed to review the accounts which follow after the crucifixion, and in these we find cases of visions and dreams similar but more in number than those which have been named, belonging to preceding times. Of these St Peter speaks in his address to the multitude on the day of Pentecost, when he quoted the prophet Joel about the wonders which should happen "in the last days." Among these wonders it is declared that your "young men shall see visions, and your old men dream dreams." (Acts, ii, 17.)

The first spiritual appearance was vouchsafed to St Stephen, who, when on the point of being stoned, declared that he "saw the heavens opened, and the Son of God standing on the right hand of God." (Acts, vii, 56.) Whether Stephen ever saw Jesus Christ whilst he was alive on earth, is a question which must ever remain unanswered. Not a word has been left us on the subject, and the conjectures which some have ventured to make have no other effect than to encumber the history with a multitude of imaginary details.

Next in order comes the vision by which was wrought the conversion of Saul, afterwards Paul, at whose feet the men who had stoned Stephen laid down their garments. This will require a more full consideration when we come to the history of St Paul himself. But a vision was at the same time granted to Ananias, who is described as a "certain disciple at Damascus." The Lord,—that is no longer God himself, as sometimes in the Old Testament, but Jesus in the New,—spoke unto him in a vision, and told him to find out Paul and communicate with him respecting his future life. But there is recorded a third vision made to St Paul himself after the first which occurred on the road, and apparently after he had taken lodgings in Damascus, and in this vision Paul had seen this very Ananias coming in and

putting his hand on his eyes that he might recover the sight which had been obscured by the vision that appeared to him on the way. (Acts, ix, 10-12.)

A fourth vision was made to Cornelius, a centurion of the Italian band, posted at Cæsarea.

He saw in a vision evidently about the ninth hour of the day an angel of God coming in to him, and saying, 'Cornelius.' [x, 3.]

The object of this vision was that Cornelius might send to Joppa and call for Simon Peter, who would instruct Cornelius more fully in his Christian duties.

But meanwhile a fifth vision occurred to St Peter, when he was taught by the vessel like a sheet let down from heaven, that nothing which God made should be called common or unclean. (Acts, x, 17.)

It was perhaps not long after these events that another supernatural interference with the order of nature occurred, which we may regard as a sixth vision. St Peter, having been imprisoned by Herod, was released by an angel, who told Peter to follow him; but Peter, although he followed him out of the prison, "wist not that it was true which was done by the angel, but thought he saw a vision." (xii, 9.) We have here a plain distinction drawn between real supernatural appearances and visions such as are seen in dreams.

St Peter evidently doubted whether he was not still asleep, but soon discovered by his miraculous release that what he had seen was a real personal being, sent for the purpose of enabling him to escape.

But who can forbear passing some comment on the fate of the poor soldiers, who were called to account and actually put to death for neglecting their duty as warders? It would seem possible, and most desirable, to ascribe some error in the tradition by which such a narrative was handed down, although the account seems to have passed lightly over the conscience of the historian who records these incidents, and it would be more consistent with our modern rules of casuistry that the escape of Peter, ascribed reverentially by him and his friends to the divine intervention, should have been allowed to be brought about by the human agency of those who were interested therein.

The subject of "visions and revelations" is discussed by St Paul (II Cor. xii, 1), as we shall see more fully hereafter;

and may here be concluded by reference to the book of Revelation, which is full of supernatural scenes, related with much elevation of style, but such obscurity of application that, whereas several hundred bulky volumes have been written about it, the text itself seems still to be more plain and intelligible than all the explanations that have been written.

CHAPTER X.

The Gift of Tongues.

We are informed in the book of the Acts of the Apostles (ii, 1) that on the day of Pentecost, which, according to one account, followed about forty days after the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, the disciples were "all with one accord in one place." For what purpose they were assembled we are not told, but the fact of their being still in Jerusalem would lead us to infer that the people of that city were favourably disposed, rather than otherwise, to listen to their teaching. That they had spent part of the time in their native Galilee, since they lost their master, is indeed stated by Matthew (xxviii, 10-16), as in fulfilment of a command given them by Jesus; and St John, in the last chapter (which is believed by many to have been added at a later time to his Gospel), relates more fully certain incidents which there befel at the meeting between the eleven disciples and Jesus. But it is unsatisfactory to find that Jesus, at their previous meeting, enjoined on them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait until the promise of divine aid, which he

had given them from the Father, should be fulfilled. The whole of the first chapter of the Acts, in which this is related, leaves us to believe that the command was obeyed, although it is difficult to see how in such a case they could have resumed their occupation of fishing far away in Galilee, without departing from Jerusalem and so breaking the command given them by Jesus to remain there.

Omitting then further mention of preceding events, let us see what took place on the day of Pentecost when the eleven original disciples were assembled in one place.

> Suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting, and there appeared unto them cloven* tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. [Acts, ii, 2-4.]

The news of this miracle was noised abroad, and the people flocked together to see those who had received such a wonderful gift from heaven. There were Jews from all the neighbouring countries of the East, in which emigrants from Palestine had settled. All these were confounded, because every man heard the apostles speak, each in his own language, "the wonderful works of God."

The historian tells us of what nations these men were who witnessed this astonishing display of power. They were visitors not only from various parts of Judæa, and almost every province of Asia Minor, but also from Parthia, Arabia, Crete, Egypt, and some of the provinces of Africa which lie on the west of Egypt, along the shores of the Mediterranean Sea. Most readers naturally and unthinkingly believe, and it has been the unvarying belief of centuries, that the apostles, to whom this miraculous power was given, spoke to those who heard them, not in their own Galilean dialect of Hebrew, but in the language spoken by each man of the various nations to whom their admonition or preaching might be addressed. Whatever may have been the real character of the incident, we cannot doubt

---

* It is wonderful how long this mistranslation of the word *diamerizomenai* has kept its place in our Bibles: its plain meaning is *distributed*, and it is used in this sense by Plato. The Latin vulgate has *dispertitæ*, which surely might have guided the translators and saved us the absurd pictures which have been made to represent the *cloven* tongues, and the use of clerical bands, which were supposed to be emblems of the inspiration and the mode in which it was conveyed.

that he who wrote the Acts of the Apostles both himself understood, and has given his readers to understand it, in the manner just described. Nor, indeed, has there been any point of time since the beginning of our era until these modern days, when any doubt was likely to be felt on a subject which seemed so long settled. For there has no doubt been a feeling of appropriateness, that those, who were sent forth to preach to various peoples, should be endowed with greater facility of preaching than their natural powers would furnish. The difference of language has always been a hindrance to free universal intercourse between men of different races, and so there has been little tendency to doubt the fact, that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost enabled the apostles to converse without difficulty and to preach to all those whom they wished to convert to Christianity.

Notwithstanding, however, the simple and plain words in which the gift of tongues is related, there is no passage in the New Testament confirming the usual interpretation which is given to this supposed faculty of speaking all languages. We cannot doubt that the power of speaking with tongues was thought to accompany or flow from the gift of the Holy Ghost. This is confirmed by a second exhibition of the same kind as the former, which had been granted to the apostles and the people of Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost.

We read in the tenth chapter of the Acts an account of Peter's visit to Cornelius, and of the address which he made to the kinsmen and near friends of this centurion. The sequel demands our attention.

> While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues and magnify God. Then answered Peter: "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost, as well as we?" And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. [Acts, x, 44-48.]

We have here what we should now look upon as a singular order of things: these Gentiles, friends of Cornelius, receive the Holy Ghost by some outward token, manifest, as it would appear, to the bystanders who were of the circumcision, that is Jews: they then begin at once to

speak with tongues and magnify God: after which they are allowed to undergo the ceremony of baptism, which in later times, however still held in reverence, has been thought by many not to be conferred as a mark of higher antecedent privileges, but rather as the means of conferring the privilege to receive the Holy Ghost by a less manifest spiritual operation.

That we are not mistaken in the sense of the second event, is confirmed by the words in which Peter describes it to the other apostles when he returned to Jerusalem. He says that he no sooner began to speak in the house of Cornelius than "the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning." (Acts, xi, 15.) Whether those on whom it fell spoke with tongues, as evidence of their inspiration, we are left to judge.

It is worthy of notice that a similar scene takes place in the course of St Paul's missionary travels. He came to Ephesus, and taught certain, who had received only the baptism of John, without (as it appears) receiving the Holy Ghost, that they ought to be baptized in the name of Jesus. They consented to this, and then

> When Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. [Acts, xix, 6.]

Here the operations are inverted: baptism precedes and is followed by the gift of the Spirit and the power of speaking with tongues, and it is only further to be remarked, one would think the baptism of St John the Baptist, here ignored, might have qualified the recipients for receiving the Holy Spirit and the gift of tongues, which had been given to those whom St Peter met, without their having been baptized at all.

These privileges, however, lie within the province of supernatural religion, whereas we are concerned in endeavouring to ascertain the meaning of the gift of tongues. It cannot be believed that the Gentiles whom Peter is said to have taught and afterwards baptized, spoke then in different languages, which they before were ignorant of. To whom should they so speak? They seem to have come together as friends and kinsmen of Cornelius. What good end could be answered by their talking to one another or to Peter in strange and unknown languages? It was evidently a display of supernatural power which was the object of this

exhibition, and not the advantage of communicating with men of other nations in any of the languages which were spoken by those with whom they had to deal. We shall be able to prove that this was the real object of the miraculous gift, and not the apparent object of giving greater facility to preach the Gospel.

The way in which the Holy Ghost was communicated to the disciples on the day of Pentecost is very nearly the same as that in which it was bestowed on Jesus himself at his baptism, as recorded narratively by the three synoptical evangelists, and related afterwards from the mouth of John the Baptist by the fourth evangelist. There is only one variation between the manifestation recorded in the four Gospels and that which we are now considering as related in the Acts of the Apostles. Whilst the form in which the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus was that of a dove, the apostles received each in the form of a tongue that same manifestation of power which was so effectual then, if not afterwards, in striking wonder into the people of Jerusalem. In the case of a miracle so remarkable, and contravening so signally all natural occurrences, one would think it quite sufficient to leave the description of it in the form in which the author of the Acts has left it. This reserve, however, has not commended itself to every writer. The author of the "Life and Work of St Paul" has expanded the short description, quoted in the beginning of this chapter, into a form rather poetical than historical, such as is not likely to render more intelligible or trustworthy an event which has always given a handle to cavillers, by some of whom it is doubted whether it ever happened at all. The passage referred to in the able work of Dr Farrar, runs thus:

It came from heaven with the sound of a rushing mighty wind, filling the whole house where they were sitting, and with a semblance as of infolded flame, which, parting itself in every direction, played like a tongue of lambent light over the head of every one of them. It was not wind, but "a sound as of wind in its rushing violence;" it was not fire, but something which seemed to them like quivering tongues of a flame which gleamed but did not burn—fit symbol of that Holy Spirit which, like the wind, bloweth where it listeth, though we know not whence it cometh or whither it goeth; and like the kindled fire of love, glowing on the holy altar of every faithful heart, utters, not seldom, even from the stammering lips of ignorance, the burning words of inspiration. [Vol. i, p. 92.]

It is not easy to see how this expansion of a simple, although miraculous fact, can be of benefit to a modern reader; and it may perhaps throw some light upon this and all other passages in the New Testament where the words *wind* and *ghost* or *spirit* occur, if it be pointed out that the words which are three in English, conveying three different ideas, are but one in Greek. Thus in John, iii, 8, it is said that "the wind bloweth where it listeth," &c., "and so is every one that is born of the Spirit." In this verse the Greek word which represents *wind* at the beginning is used also to represent the *Spirit* at its end: the word is *pneuma** in both cases; nor is the device, which the printers adopt, of using a capital S for the last word *Spirit*, sufficient to exempt the passage from a certain ambiguity which one might wish did not occur in matters so important to every Christian. That the books of the New Testament were written in Greek needs no proof, but that the writers were Greeks and not Hebrews will hardly be admitted by every one even in the present age of advanced knowledge and criticism; whilst the singular occurrence of the word *pneuma*, which in no other language standing alone could mean both *wind* and the *Holy Spirit*, seems to favour an interpretation which all are not yet willing to accept.

It remains now to show how the narrative of the gift of tongues, as found in the Acts of the Apostles, is interpreted by certain critics as denoting something very different from that which is accepted without enquiry and in full belief by the common English reader. Previously, however, to entering upon this enquiry, which must in any case be brief and does not require for English readers to be extended to any great length, we may observe that the common interpretation is not borne out by any single passage in the Epistles where the subject is mentioned.

Taking the Epistles in order as they are placed in our canon, we meet with a detailed account, in St Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians, of the various spiritual privileges given to different Christians—wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, prophecy, the discerning of spirits, and

to another *divers* kinds of tongues, to another the interpretation of tongues. [xii, 8-9.]

---

* The revisers of the New Testament have retained the inconsistency of rendering the same Greek word in the same verse as both *wind* and *spirit*: but they have added in the margin the alternative rendering, "The Spirit breatheth" for "The wind bloweth."

This is a remarkable passage, and brings us into the very heart of the subject. The gift of tongues—not here called unknown tongues—is bestowed on one man, and the power of declaring his meaning is given to another. It might not unreasonably be thought that such a tongue would be neither the man's native tongue, which he certainly would have known, nor any other well-defined foreign tongue, which would be of no use to him, unless he had at hand some one who could interpret it, and in this case those who had the gift could never make use of it unless they went about two and two together. It seems absurd to believe that any one could have the knowledge how to speak a language without knowing the meaning of what he said. The writer of the Epistle does indeed at the end of the same chapter signify plainly that these gifts were not bestowed on all. "Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" (xii, 30.) In the next chapter (xiii) the Apostle contrasts all these gifts with the practice of charity: prophecies, he tells us, shall fail, tongues shall cease, and knowledge shall vanish away.

We may remark upon this, that, if the knowledge of foreign tongues, useful for missionary purposes, was the gift bestowed upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost, it is hardly to be thought that the knowledge would so soon be doomed to the extinction which befel it, as seems to be foreshadowed in anticipation by St Paul. The whole of the ensuing chapter, the fourteenth, is full of this subject: it is too long to quote at large: the words in which St Paul refers to it cannot be misunderstood. He that speaks in a tongue [the word unknown is not sanctioned by the Greek] speaks to God, not to men—no one understands him—he edifieth himself only—he that prophesieth is greater than he that speaketh with tongues unless he interpret, [but the two are in many cases distinct]—unless words are uttered easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? The hearer and the speaker alike will be barbarians to one another—how can any one pray or say Amen to prayers unless he knows what is said? Tongues are a sign not to believers, but to unbelievers. If a whole congregation speak with tongues, strangers will think them mad. Two or three only are to speak with tongues in the church, and "let one interpret: but if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church and speak to himself and to God."

Such is a short summary of the words of St Paul, and it might seem to many readers that the writer does not

hold in high esteem the gift of which he is speaking. And yet he says:

I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than you all. Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that *by my voice* I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an *unknown* [interpolated] tongue. [18-19.] . . . Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues. [39.] XIV. 39

The testimony which the Epistles of St Paul in these extracts afford is certainly strong against the common interpretation of the gift of tongues, and this testimony is well confirmed by the absence of any occasion on which the knowledge of a foreign language is mentioned in the New Testament as used by any of the disciples. The chief captain of the Temple, when St Paul wished to speak unto him, said in reply, "Canst thou speak Greek?" (Acts, xxi, 37.) So far from Paul being known to possess all languages, it was a matter of doubt to the Roman officer, whether he could speak a language even so common as the Greek. Nor can it escape the notice of readers that the gift of tongues is not mentioned in any other part of the New Testament, which is of undoubted authenticity,* than the Acts of the Apostles and the First Epistle to the Corinthians. It is far from doubtful that the book of the Acts was written by some adherent to the Pauline system of religion, in opposition to the Judaic Christianity, which was antagonistic to St Paul. If this be so, the greater fervour and enthusiasm which have always been ascribed to St Paul, and no doubt extended to his followers, may have given rise to those exhibitions in the Christian congregation, which at length drew upon them the moderating admonitions of St Paul. Prayer, unless regulated by stated forms, and controlled by prudence, is apt to stray into by-paths and to become extravagant both in word and thought. The narratives which occur in the Acts, are probably somewhat hyperbolical in their statements, as indeed is generally the case with writings of which miracles are a leading feature. But this does not form a sound objection to the general truth of this book as regards its leading facts. The

* The exception is Mark, xvi, 17: the last twelve verses of this Gospel are a late interpolation: the prediction that the disciples should speak with new tongues and take up serpents, is a pretty conclusive proof that it was written after the adventure which happened to St Paul in the island of Melite.

exhibition of tongues—*unknown* as they are termed in the authorized version, but with no word to warrant it in the Greek—is not altogether unknown in modern times. Religious societies, formed out of the lowest and most unlearned men, have upheld modes of worship, by which its members have been led to adopt the most rash and even immoral practices, with hymns of doubtful tendency, and ejaculations savouring of madness rather than of piety. The name of Ranters has sometimes been given to such a sect; and the Quakers, or Friends, as they prefer to be called, although a most estimable body of Christians in private life, have rendered themselves somewhat liable to the same criticism by the claim to a certain kind of inspiration, without which no one is supposed to speak in their assembly. But a more thorough illustration of the gift of tongues, as described in St Paul's Epistles, is found in the practice of the Irvingites, a sect which took its rise fifty years ago under the guidance of the Rev. Edward Irving, and which continues within more moderate bounds even at the present day. Among the members of this sect an exhibition would from time to time take place, which can hardly be explained otherwise than by the same fervour and enthusiasm which was seen on the day of Pentecost. A family, which had imbibed the tenets of the Irvingites, were assembled for evening prayers in the parlour of a family resident in the Tower of London. In the midst of the reading, one of the maid-servants rising on her knees, and turning round with her eyes pointed to heaven, poured forth a series of incoherent words for one or two minutes. The prayers were stopped, and when the maid ceasing her ejaculations returned to her former posture, they were resumed without a word being said on what had happened, and the party separated.* It is not becoming to question the sincerity of religious persons, whatever their practices or whatever their professions, if conducted within the limits of morality and the public good: but, if practices can be adduced from later times which seem to explain what is recorded in the Bible, it is not contrary either to morality or the public good that such illustrations should be brought forward.

If then it should be thought reasonable that what took place at the feast of Pentecost was simply the over-wrought

* This scene was enacted (January, 1835) in the presence of my father, who returned to my house the same evening, and expressed his strong disapproval of what he had seen.—J. A. G.

desire of giving strength to religion by incoherent ejaculations such as might appear strange to those who were not influenced by the same feelings, it might be thought that this was transformed afterwards gradually into the miracle of languages from the general tendency to progressive enhancement of the miraculous, and the conclusion will come nearer to the truth, if we consider that certain other interpretations have been brought forward, only to be again rejected and set aside as opposed to the plain meaning of the words.

In the first place it has been suggested that the miracle of tongues* was wrought rather on the hearers than on the speakers; in other words, that the apostles spoke in their own language, and that what they said found its way to the ears of all those who heard it translated supernaturally into the language of each person to whom it was addressed. This interpretation, although very ancient, has not found much respect on the score of religion or of common sense, nor does it appear any longer to keep its ground among the theories which this subject has produced. It is not consistent with the statement that the apostles spake with *other* tongues: the word *unknown* does not occur in the Greek, or in the Latin vulgate, and has been introduced into the text of our English version, from the pardonable but erroneous idea that *other* languages than their own must have been, in the case of the apostles, unknown.

A second interpretation of the miracle which took place at the Feast of Pentecost has been derived from the modern sciences (if they may be so called) of mesmerism, spiritualism, magnetism, and other such offspring of psychologists and the imagination. But all of these require time and preparation before any such marvelous result can be obtained, and it is sufficient to name such a solution of the mystery, that it may be at once seen to be inapplicable to the case of the Apostles. A third explanation has been found in the supposition that the Spirit has a peculiar language in which its operation was carried on, and that

* Thirty-six closely printed pages have been devoted to the examination of this subject by the German critic, Zeller, in his work on the Acts of the Apostles, translated by Dare, 2 vols, 8vo, 1875. To follow him into the intricacies of his theme would create a feeling of tediousness in the English reader, who has only to determine between three alternatives, whether the narrative contained in the Acts is (1) strictly true in all its details, (2) a later development of details based on a groundwork of truth, or (3) a pure fiction.

those who were influenced by it would necessarily make use of such language. This, however, seems to differ very little from the incoherent ejaculations already described as practised by the Irvingites, and is not far removed from the operations of the lingual gift, to the consideration of which St Paul devotes a whole chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, and is liable to the same objection which is there stated, that such speaking could have no good effect in preaching the Gospel either to Jews or Gentiles, and cannot be allowed to stand as an explanation of a practice which has no illustration in modern times above those classes of society who have been better known for enthusiasm than for common sense, and whose practice has been long eliminated from the notice of the most eminent theologians.

CHAPTER XI.

Christ's Second Coming—The Millennium.

There has always been a tradition in the Christian Church that some day or other the state of things now existing on the earth would be brought to an end by the reappearance of our Lord, who would reign as a temporal as well as spiritual sovereign over true believers, whether still then alive or recalled to life in new bodies fitted for the new existence to which they were destined. It may be admitted as probable that some such anticipation of a Saviour prevailed among the Jews from the time when the decadence of their nation began down to the Christian era. Nor has it been clearly ascertained how these anticipations are related to similar imperfect forebodings, which we read concerning the emperor Vespasian and perhaps others, prevalent elsewhere than in Judæa. It may be asserted, however, without much hesitation, that neither the one nor the other is connected in the slightest degree with the so-called vaticinations obscurely shadowed out by Virgil in his beautiful eclogue which bears the name of Pollio. We have seen more than one Saviour of society in modern times, without any need of believing in their supernatural origin or in the reality of their pretensions. But the belief in a millennium or space of a thousand years, in which Christ would return and reign on earth, was current from the earliest date of the Gospel; as we learn from Eusebius (iii, 39) quoting, although not in direct words, from Papias bishop of Hierapolis, who was, as Eusebius tells us, a very little-minded man, whilst his writings, which except these small remains have perished, would, from their historical nature, have compensated us for the loss of many other treatises that have reached our times in safety.

The anticipation that a Redeemer would at some future time arise among the Jews, limited from the first to the appearance of a king or temporal ruler, is strongly shown in numberless passages of the Gospels. The hymns of Mary, of Simeon, and of Anna, were evidently written before the Gospel was reduced to writing, and probably in the Hebrew tongue, as then spoken in the city of

Jerusalem. Is it certain that they were not first applied to the long-existing sentiment of the nation, and afterwards with certain modifications applied to the advent of the Redeemer who was to be the Son of God?

All these hymns are in a poetical style, different from that of the narrative which accompanies them; they appear like jewels set in a frame, and are evidently more ancient than that frame, like the songs of Moses, Miriam, and others, which are found in the Old Testament, and probably go back to the earliest age in which Hebrew poetry was written. Between the time when these hymns were spoken in the Temple and elsewhere, and the appearance of Jesus as a teacher, we can hardly believe that they were preserved by the tradition of those who heard them spoken: they were more probably preserved in writing and afterwards inserted in the four Gospels.

During the progress of Christ's ministry, which certainly did not last three years, and, as the ancient fathers believed, not much more than one, we find from the very beginning traces, more or less obscure, that the period which we call the Millennium was expected. Towards the end of that ministry these traces become more plain, until they obtain a certain significance which unreflecting readers of the New Testament explain away or ignore altogether.

That words spoken by our Lord, with a general and therefore a vague signification, should at first be received as direct and definite prophecy, would by no means be of exceptional occurrence in the history of mankind.

But the form which these intimations of a future Paradise on earth has assumed in our books, is too decided to allow of our explaining them away by any secondary interpretation.

The belief in our Lord's speedy coming again prevailed for many years, and was not abandoned until long after the books of the New Testament were known throughout the world. If the three first evangelists have recorded the words of our Saviour correctly in the following extracts, it is not possible to deny the conclusion at which we have arrived.

MATT. xvi, 28.—Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.

MARK, ix, 1.—And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you that there be some of them which stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power.

Luke, ix, 27.—But I tell you of a truth, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God.

The references to the same event are too numerous to admit a doubt. The very words of Jesus are recorded in the following brief sentences:

Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel, till the Son of Man be come. [Matt. x, 23.]
Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this generation. [Matt. xxiii, 36.]
Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled. [Matt. xxiv, 34.]
Verily I say unto you, That this generation shall not pass, till all these things be done. [Mark, xiii, 30.]
Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled. [Luke, xxi, 32.]

The drift of these extracts is more evident from their juxta-position, and their weight is more forcible from their brevity. The last three of them are followed by descriptions of the awful wonders which would accompany Christ's second appearance on earth. The "abomination of desolation" was first to stand in the holy place—nation to rise up against nation—tribulation such as was not since the beginning of the world—and then St Matthew tells us:

Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with the great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather his Elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. [Matt. xxiv, 29-31.]

The parallel passages in Mark and Luke agree more or less in this description, and in many parts of it, they are expressed in the very same words. In the fourth Gospel, however, there is but scanty mention of Christ's second coming, as indeed we might expect from a writing in which moral and doctrinal lessons are taught, and narrative of fact, or sequence of chronology, is thought of minor value.

It was not to be expected that these repeated predictions of a future state of things, commending itself to the aspirations both of religion and of patriotism, would pass unheeded by the Jews. His own brothers and sisters indeed did not from the first believe in him, and is it not certain that the multitude were influenced by other motives than wonder and reverence for the deeds of mercy and benevolence which he performed? Still they seem to have fallen in with the belief of a divine kingdom speedily to appear. St Luke says:

> He spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. [LUKE, xix, 11.]

This belief was not extinguished by the crucifixion of the Master. No sooner do they meet him again after his resurrection, than the same subject recurs to their thoughts. "Wilt thou," they say, "at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (ACTS, i, 6.) It is not, however, the kingdom of God that they wish to be restored, but the independence of their nation; and it is very likely that this desire may explain the zeal with which so many of the people followed him on all occasions and hung upon the words of his mouth. That the accusation of treason to the Roman emperor was brought against him before Pilate will to a certain point explain the fact of his condemnation. In the accounts of his trial, which have come down to us in the four Gospels, the blasphemy of his claiming to be the Son of God and a spiritual king is so mixed up with the crime of rebellion against the Roman emperor and the established government, that the ordinary reader is not prepared to distinguish between the two. The narratives have evidently been coloured so as to suit the feelings of Christians, with whom the conduct of Pilate, whatever might have been the grounds of his judgement, would equally have been condemned. The execration, with which his name has always been received, seems to be undeserved. The prisoner, brought before him, was charged with treason, and when questioned, did not deny, if we may believe the narrative of St John (xviii, 37), that he was a king, and although this kingship is pointed out as referring to a spiritual kingdom, and although Pilate sought to release him on that ground, yet it is clear that the accusation of rebellion, evinced not many days before by the triumphant entry into Jerusalem, was such as Pilate could not safely evade. The clamours of

the Jews also would naturally have their weight. If Pilate favoured a criminal against whom such a charge was brought, he might find the accusation transferred against himself as no friend to the imperial government. Nor can it be justly said that spiritual authority is practically distinct from temporal supremacy. It has often happened that the one has led to the other, as in the case not only of the Lama of Thibet, the Pope of Rome, and others, but also of every bishop in the entire Christian world. Pilate could hardly be censured if he thought the spiritual claim of kingship, supported by such demonstrations as had already been made by the Jewish people, would end in the claim of temporal dominion and the freedom of the Jewish people from the Roman yoke.

Neither was there irregularity in the hour at which the trial took place. The Jewish Priests and Scribes had arrested Jesus in the night, but the day had begun and the hour of public business had arrived, when the trial of Jesus took place before Pilate. The speed with which the sentence was executed may be explained by the recollection that the criminal was in the hands of the Jewish magistrates, who were not likely to forego the opportunity of crushing an obnoxious reforming teacher.

All this would, in ordinary cases, have deterred the followers of such a teacher from maintaining the belief that his glorious promises would be realized, and that he would himself come back to realize them. Yet we find that, when he discourses with them after his resurrection, they ask him, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts, i, 6.) They were unable to see that the kingdom which he had promised, was a spiritual, not a temporal sovereignty, and they soon found that it was a kingdom into which other nations besides the Jews were to be admitted.

We are not told what length of time passed whilst the twelve Apostles remained in Jerusalem preparing for the ministry to which they were destined. The first event of importance in relation to the Second Coming of Jesus is the healing of the lame man, when Peter, addressing the people, hints vaguely at some future event, for which they were to prepare themselves.

Repent ye therefore and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come, from the presence of the Lord. [Acts, iii, 19.]

In this passage, as in every case, where the name of God is not added, "our Lord" designates Jesus Christ, and although the second coming of Jesus is not described as about to happen at once, and indeed there is rather a confusion of events in the whole speech of Peter, we can hardly doubt that the idea of his return to earth was present to the mind of the speaker.

Omitting then for the present any further reference to St Peter's opinion on this subject, and taking the Epistles in order as they occur in the New Testament, we find very strong indications that such an expectation was thought to be on the point of being speedily realized. This would cause us no surprise, if it were any of the twelve Apostles who wrote these Epistles, wherein such a miraculous event was pointed out. The twelve and others, who accompanied Jesus, had heard their master repeatedly declare that he would return to them speedily. But St Paul had never seen Jesus when alive: he had seen him in a vision, and that too of a very exceptional character; for, whilst he for the remainder of his life strongly insisted on his having had a clear and positive interview with his Saviour, yet this interview seems to have been rather subjective than objective, and limited to Paul himself; for those who were with him were evidently very slightly affected by what had taken place. Whether they saw the light, and heard a voice, or not; whatever might have occurred to them, they probably assisted him when he rose from the ground, and when his eyes were opened and he could not see, they led him into Damascus. Where then did Paul obtain the information about the speedy coming of the Lord, which authorized his making such clear declarations as those which occur in his epistles?

In his Epistle to the Romans it is not possible to mistake his meaning.

> Knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light. [Rom. xiii, 11.]

These words too are addressed to the Romans, and St Paul had never been at Rome when he wrote them: but when in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, among whom he had worked as a tent-maker eighteen months or more, he describes the wonders which should accompany the Lord at

his coming, we cannot deny that he might feel a natural interest in his correspondents, however we might be at a loss to know what was his authority for what he wrote.

Behold, I show you a mystery: We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. [I Cor. xv, 51.]

In his Epistle to the Philippians a similar, although much shorter, and even stronger notification occurs.

Let your moderation be known unto all men: the Lord is at hand. [Phil. iv, 5.]

The next extract which bears upon our present subject is from the First Epistle to the Thessalonians. Here he again gives scope to his bent in describing the wonders of Christ's coming, and he describes with bold minuteness the resurrection of those who were dead, and the ascent to heaven of both dead and living. Why this description should be vouchsafed to the Thessalonians, by whom he had bitterly been persecuted, we have no information.

If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, That we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [i.e. *go before*] them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we, which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. [I Thess. iv, 14.]

It is equally remarkable, that in a second Epistle to the Thessalonians we should find a strong caution against too ready an acceptation of what he had previously written on the subject of the Resurrection and of Christ's coming. The names of Silvanus and Timothy are associated with that of Paul as addressing the two Epistles to the Thessalonians. Whether this might have modified the tendency of those Epistles, we cannot say; but if it was remarkable that Paul should write at all to those who had used him badly, it is more so that he should have written to them a second time. The words referred to here follow:

Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together to him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit nor by word nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means, for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the Temple of God, showing himself that he is God. [II Thess. ii, 1-4.]

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, however, has less claim to have St Paul for its author, we find the same expectation of the Messiah's return, although less pointed than in the preceding extracts.

For ye have need of patience, that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. For yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry. [Heb. x, 36.]

After St Paul we come to the seven General Epistles, as they are termed. The first of these is ascribed to James—whichever of those who bore that name it may be. Then follow two ascribed to Peter; three to John; and one to Jude or Judas. The first of these gives good advice to the brethren, such as was well adapted to the time, when they were beginning to be impatient about the delay of our Lord's coming, whilst still insisting that it was near at hand.

Be patient, therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain. Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh. [James, v, 8.]

The advice thus given by St James is enforced by St Peter in his First Epistle. He tells the brethren to—

gird up the loins of your mind for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the Revelation of Jesus Christ. [i, 13.]

He points out, further on, how it is that they have incurred the jealousy and enmity of the Gentiles, consoling them with the fact that the end is not far off.

They [the Gentiles] think it strange, that you run not with them to the same excess of riot, speaking evil of you: who shall

give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead. For, for this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit. But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer. [I Peter, iv, 4-7.]

In the Second Epistle of Peter we obtain a deeper insight into the opinions of the age, and what we there find strongly supports the opinion that this Epistle was written at a much later date. The writer quotes the words of those who were impatient of the delay in Christ's coming, or who even doubted that he would come at all.

Where is the promise of his coming? For since the [*our*] fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. [II Peter, iii, 4.]

St Peter had prepared himself to answer these cavillers in the former part of his Epistle. He acknowledges that he had certainly foretold the coming of Jesus, in these words:

For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. [II Peter, i, 16.]

But now he endeavours to meet their complaint of the delay, and his reply, whilst it repeats the statement of the wonders which will accompany his coming, seems to prepare the way for the pause in the general belief that it was so near at hand. We cannot say when the Church first began to refer these prophecies no longer to a visible reappearance of Jesus in the flesh, but sometimes to the Day of Judgement, and at other times (as amongst ourselves) even to the day when each individual Christian should die. St Peter cautions his readers not to be—

Ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. [II Peter, iii, 8.]

This, however, is not a satisfactory answer to the complaint of these cavillers, who must have felt that the life of man is limited to some seventy or eighty years, and who had entertained the belief, confirmed by the words of all the apostles, that the present generation should not pass until all those things should be done. And yet St Peter asserts that the

"Lord is not slack concerning his promise as some men count slackness" (iii, 9); and he again indulges in an elevated description of what should happen when the Lord should come—

The day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein shall be burnt up. Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness? Looking for and hastening unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. . . . Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless. [iii, 10-14.]

In the First Epistle of St John we find similar indications that Jesus was expected almost immediately to return to the earth, and we find in his statement what seems to satisfy the conditions, within which St Paul, in his Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (ii, 1-4), had limited the prevalent expectation. There was to be a falling away from the faith, and the man of sin, son of perdition, who opposeth himself to God, was to be revealed. But if we may believe what St John tells us, this man of sin and son of perdition was revealed already. The Antichrist, of whom he speaks, was not one only, but many, and the name is not of an individual but of many who were opposed to God and Christ.

Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists, whereby we know that it is the last time. [I John, ii, 18.]

In the last book of our Canon, the Revelation, ascribed to the same John, we find one verse only which may here be quoted: it describes, in terms similar to others already given, the certain coming of the Lord, and the wonders which will attend his coming. But it is so mixed up with other prophesies and visions, that it is difficult to discover how far the imagery, with which the whole book is full, is the offspring of the more simple belief in the immediate appearance of the Lord, set forth in the Gospels, the Epistles, and in some passages of the Acts of the Apostles, already cited.

Behold, he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him,

and they also which pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so. Amen. [REVEL. i, 7.]

It can hardly be doubted by those who weigh these authorities taken from almost every part of the New Testament, that the first Christians, including the twelve disciples, believed that the Lord Jesus, whom they had seen crucified, and afterwards ascending to heaven, would come again and assume the position of king over the Jewish people. The nature of this kingdom may have been doubtful from the first. To restore the kingdom to Israel would mean that the nation should be released from the Roman government, and restored to independence: but as the national government had been for a long time in the hands of high priests, the idea of a heavenly kingdom also might gradually find its way into the minds of Scribes and Pharisees, when the great teacher was no longer present to refute their pretensions and to relieve the people from the oppressive subtleties of their law. Whatever might be the cause that so soon brought about the reconciliation between Christianity and Judaism, as we find it in the narrative of events which happened to St James the Just, it is evident that for the space of an hundred years it was the fixed belief of Christians that our Lord would come again and establish a kingdom of some kind or other on earth and in the city of Jerusalem. Now as this is not only insisted upon by the Apostles themselves, who wrote the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, but is also described as clearly prophesied by Christ himself; and as on the other hand the event so prophesied failed to happen, it results that the Apostles were deceived in their expectation, and that their prophecy was simply their own private opinion, uninfluenced by any such divine inspiration as we have been in the habit of attaching to every statement contained in the Scriptures.

It is indeed not often stated by St Paul that his admonitions and other remarks are dictated directly by inspiration, and he does in the case of a widow actually declare that he is giving his own opinion, when in his First Epistle to the Corinthians he writes as follows:

> She is happier if she so abide, after my judgement; and I think also that I have the Spirit of God. [I COR. vii, 40.]

It might be suggested without offence to truth, that all the words which have been handed down to us in our

Scriptures may be interpreted in the same way; and thus every prognostication of the future is limited within that power, which the possession of reason has given mankind to judge of what will happen hereafter by duly weighing the events which have happened within their experience already. But the words of our Lord himself, as we read them in the Gospels, are stronger than any that were spoken or written after his departure. Were his words misunderstood and misinterpreted by those who heard him? Have the four Gospels been tampered with, or their sense altered or modified by ignorant copyists in these, as we know they have in other passages? Or has the national zeal acted without self-control upon the minds of both those who wrote and those who read the wonderful history of Christ and his teaching, so that hints have become assertions, probabilities become certainties, and the whole tenour of a doctrine concerning some of its parts been magnified by the imagination into a form less reconcilable with the simple fact? Any reasonable interpretation, by which we can escape from the belief that our Lord to whom we ascribe divine power was deceived in a matter of so much interest to the human race, would be more acceptable to all right-minded men, than any other explanation which would leave so wide and important a question still without an adequate solution.

But the subject of Christ's second coming cannot well be limited to the forebodings and notices which are found in the Christian writings. There are similar notices among the Greeks and Romans and eastern nations of the Apostolic age, which it would not be right to pass over.

The anecdote of the emperor Vespasian, related in the last chapter, indicates that there was a prevailing opinion of some great potentate or conqueror being about to arise, and this expectation was centred, contrary to what might have been expected, on the emperor Nero. It was thought and very widely believed that he was not dead, and this belief would naturally lead to impostors rising up, who would pretend to be that monarch still alive. It is notorious that frauds of this kind have been perpetrated in every age and in every country of the world; nor is the known tyranny of the most arbitrary tyrant any guarantee that he will not be supported by a party even when the fraud has been exposed and punished.

Suetonius tells us, in his Life of Nero (58), that notwithstanding the cruelties which that emperor practised, he had a large number of partizans in every country of the East,

and that these gave great annoyance to the existing governments by their assertion that the emperor either was not dead, or if dead, would come to life again. Such an opinion was not likely to prevail without producing its usual results. Impostors would naturally take advantage of the state of things. The same writer tells us of such an one, who gave trouble for some time, but was at last got rid of. His words are these:

> Twenty years after [Nero's death], when I was a young man, there appeared a man, of uncertain rank in life, who boasted that he was Nero, and the man was so favourably received among the Parthians, that they gave him much help, and were with difficulty persuaded to give him up [to the Romans]. [SUETON. *Nero*, 57.]

The Parthians indeed commenced war against the Romans, in what Tacitus (H. i, 2) calls "the farce of the pretended Nero;" and shortly afterwards, as we learn from the same historian (ii, 8), the whole of Asia Minor and Greece, which then passed under its Roman name of Achaia, was roused by the false report that Nero was approaching.

It is worthy of remark that whilst this report of Nero's return to life prevailed over all the East, the Jews and Christians were entertaining a similar expectation that our Lord would again appear on earth. It is thought that the woes and tribulations, which are alluded to in the passages quoted in this chapter, derive their origin from the calamities which the world suffered under the government of Nero. But whilst the greater part of mankind regarded him as a tyrant, and the rest looked with eager expectation to his speedy return, the Jews had thought only of some Messiah or Redeemer, whose coming would bring good to their nation only: and the Christians, trusting and believing in the speedy coming of Jesus, and perhaps looking on Nero as the Antichrist, or as one of the many Antichrists, of whom St John speaks, were not convinced of their mistake until the course of events rendered it impossible that what they expected should come to pass.

But the Jews at this time abounded in all the great cities of the East, and were indeed, in the judgement of the Gentiles, with difficulty distinguished from the Christians. It is therefore highly probable that the views and expectations of all these three classes became blended

together and produced that incoherent tradition which has come down to our time.

The tradition lasted to a very late date. It was still current in the time of Dion Chrysostom, and appears in the eighth book of the Sibylline Oracles, expressed in words which cannot be misinterpreted, although obscured by the metrical form in which all these prophecies are conveyed. The writer of the eighth book of those Oracles foretells the reign of fifteen Roman emperors, the last of whom must of course be Hadrian. The Sibyl (viii, 64) then says that three others shall reign "fulfilling the name of the heavenly God." This singular phrase is supposed to mean that the name of Antonine, borne by the three next emperors, was connected with Adonai, the name by which the Jews, forbidden even to speak the word Jehovah, were in the habit of designating the Supreme Deity. Of these three, the first is Antoninus Pius, of whom the Sibyl speaks disparagingly and not in accordance with the voice of general history :

> One of these, the eldest, shall long wield the sceptre, melancholy king, who shall shut up and keep in his house all the wealth of the world, that when the matricidal fugitive coming from the ends of the earth shall arrive, he may distribute this wealth to all, and so make Asia rich.

These lines must have been written after A.D. 192, in which year Commodus the third Antonine was slain, and they show how long the tradition lasted that the emperor Nero would again return to life.

N.B.—Since this chapter was returned for press, I have met with the following sentence in a small pamphlet circulated for devotional purposes.

> In all of St Paul's Epistles I believe BAPTISM is only spoken of thirteen times, while they speak about the RETURN OF OUR LORD fifty times.

CHAPTER XII.

Of Joseph and Mary, the reputed Parents of Jesus—his Brethren James, Judas, Simon, and Joses—other Jews bearing the name of Jesus—Jesus Barabbas.

The Virgin Mary, mother of Jesus Christ, is worshiped in many Christian countries, even at the present time, with ceremonies better suited to the days when the heathen deities were still the objects of admiration, and their temples occupied the sites where now Christian churches have for many centuries been built. That the father, brothers, and sisters of Jesus have not been admitted to a share of the honours so amply rendered to his mother, has doubtless resulted from the wish to exclude every human agency and interest from the birth and parentage of our Lord. It has been thought derogatory to Mary that Joseph, although ostensibly her husband, should be by her the father of other children, or even of Jesus himself, and various schemes have been put forth for preserving immaculate the virginity of her who was the mother of the Christ. There are many difficulties attendant on the history of the Virgin. In the genealogy of St Luke, she is not named, which is remarkable, seeing that the descent of Jesus from David could only be traced through her, and in that gospel (iii, 23) Jesus is said to have been "(as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli," &c. It has been thought by some that the words "as was supposed" were inserted later, when the miraculous birth was more generally believed, and a positive declaration of human paternity would not have been in harmony with that belief. There is then a dilemma resulting from this genealogy. If Joseph was the real as well as putative father of Jesus, his divine origin must be otherwise interpreted than as it now is, and the miraculous conception also of Mary would require to be reconsidered. In the genealogy of Matthew (i, 16) the parentage is less expressly declared: "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, which is called Christ." A com-

munication is then made to Joseph in the words of the same gospel, which here follow.

Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost. [MATT. i, 20.]

The writer of this gospel then tells us that all this was done in order to fulfil the prophecy, that a virgin should conceive and bear a son who should be called "Emmanuel, which being interpreted is God with us." But it is somewhat remarkable that events should happen in order to fulfil prophecies, as we find it so often asserted not only here, but in almost every part of the New Testament. It seems more reasonable to suppose that the writers would quote these prophetical passages only as well suited to describe and illustrate the later events to which they may seem to present a certain similarity; and in the present case the prophecy referred to was uttered by Isaiah to Ahaz, describing what should happen to him in the weak and disordered state to which his kingdom was reduced. But an announcement made to Mary, about the same time, is much more full as to the manner in which things would be brought about. She was troubled at the first salutation of the angel, and at his saying that she should have a son, and that the Lord God would give unto him the throne of his father David. In answer to her question, "How shall all this be, seeing I know not a man?" he replies:

The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. [LUKE, i, 35.]

Here we have a description in accordance with the opinion which all later times have entertained, and it suggests clearly that the birth of Jesus was in every respect divine and irrespective of the betrothal of Mary, which had been made before the birth of her son, and irrespective of the more complete consummation of the marriage, which may be thought to have taken place afterwards. But this opinion, on the testimony of the Gospels themselves, certainly did not prevail in Judæa until after the crucifixion. When Jesus, having delivered several parables to the multitude, retired into his own country, where he taught in their synagogues, the narrative which follows shows a far different state of things.

MATTHEW, xiii, 55.

They were astonished, and said, "Whence hath this *man* this wisdom, and these mighty works? Is not this the carpenter's son? is not his mother called Mary? and his brethren, James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters, are they not all with us? Whence then hath this *man* all these things?" And they were offended in him.

MARK, vi, 2.

Many hearing him were astonished, saying, "From whence hath this *man* these things? and what wisdom *is* this which is given unto him, that even such mighty works are wrought by his hands? Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary, the brother of James, and Joses, and of Juda, and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us?" And they were offended at him.

The scene thus described by the first two evangelists is more fully described by the third. We are told by St Luke (iv, 16) that Nazareth was the place where Jesus taught in the synagogue, and that it was when he read to the people from the book of the prophet Isaiah, that the reference was made to his father and parentage generally.

All bare him witness, and wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth. And they said, "Is not this Joseph's son?" [LUKE, iv, 22.]

But the good-will of the people lasted only so long as the teaching of the great master was palateable to his hearers, but no longer so when he speaks of privileges given to other nations. He proceeded to tell them that

Many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus, the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian. And all they in the synagogue, when they heard these things, were filled with wrath, and rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him to the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong. But he, passing through the midst of them, went his way. [LUKE, iv, 27.]

We still gather from this narrative that Joseph was looked upon as the real father of Jesus; and the same inference flows from a corresponding passage in St John's Gospel, although that document is exceedingly discursive in its style, less historical in its matter, and abounding in discourses rather than in the events of our Lord's life. The cause of offence was different in this case, but the words of the people equally show their belief that Joseph was his father.

The Jews murmured at him, because he said, "I am the bread which came down from heaven." And they said, "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How is it that he saith, I am come down from heaven?" [JOHN, vi, 41-42.]

In the gospel where this passage occurs, a long argument follows, in which Jesus connects the gift of eternal life with the condition of eating his flesh and drinking his blood, and of which the result is that

Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard *this*, said, "This is an hard saying; who can hear it?" . . . From that *time* many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. [JOHN, vi, 60-66.]

Now when we consider the nature of what Jesus is here said to have taught the people, it is hardly to be wondered that many of his followers should leave him. We are, indeed, expressly told that even his brethren did not believe in him, and his mother, to whom a divine communication had been made before his birth, and who had witnessed his conversation with the doctors in the Temple, seems to the last to have had no knowledge or belief of the divine claims which he preferred. She is said to have kept in her heart all the sayings which had passed with the doctors (LUKE, ii, 51), but possibly had forgotten them, when she visited him with her other sons, and tried to recal him to his home. It cannot be doubted that it was for this purpose that they came to him, as related by St Matthew and confirmed by the two other synoptical writers, when he ignored the members of his own family, and declared that whoever did his father's will would be regarded as his brother, and sister, and mother.

MATTHEW, xii, 46.
While he yet talked to the people, behold, *his* mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him.

MARK, iii, 31.
There came then his brethren and his mother, and, standing without, sent unto him, calling him.

LUKE, viii, 19.
Then came to him *his* mother and his brethren, and could not come at him for the press.

Moreover we read in the fourth gospel that the mother of Jesus was a witness of his crucifixion, and that the disciple whom Jesus loved—supposed, but without authority, to be St John, the reputed author of that gospel—was also there;

which naturally would create no surprise, if it were not certain that one who appears so prominent on various occasions in connection with the life and death of Jesus, cannot be thought to have written a history of that life from which all mention of the most prominent circumstances is excluded.

The four evangelists all tell us, more or less correctly, who were present at the crucifixion.

MATTHEW, xxvii, 55-56.

And many women were there beholding afar off, which followed Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him: among which was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children.

MARK, xv, 40.

There were also women looking on afar off: among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome; (who also, when he was in Galilee, followed him, and ministered unto him;) and many other women which came up with him unto Jerusalem.

LUKE, xxiii, 49.

And all his acquaintance, and the women that followed him from Galilee, stood afar off, beholding these things.

JOHN, xix, 25.

Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary *the wife* of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene.

But it is remarkable that St John, the reputed writer of the fourth gospel, has never mentioned the mother of Jesus by name: the word Mary does not once occur as applied to her in any part of that book, and unless this was accidental, which scarcely is likely, the only reason that seems possible, may be drawn from the tendency of the fourth gospel to ignore all human agency, both of father and mother, as unbecoming the spiritual and heavenly character of our Lord.

But although St John does not describe the mother of Jesus by her name Mary, it is known to every reader of that gospel, that when our Lord and his disciples attended at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee,

> The mother of Jesus was there: and both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage. [JOHN, ii, 1-2.]

And yet we have no notice in that gospel that any of the disciples had then been called, with the exception of Andrew, Peter, and Philip, who introduced Nathaniel.

Our notice of the Virgin Mary concludes with a passage to be cited from the Acts, where are recorded the proceed-

ings of the apostles in Jerusalem, not long, it appears, after the crucifixion. This is the last notice of her in point of time that occurs in the New Testament.

These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren. [Acts, i, 14.]

It may, however, be as well to quote two more passages from the Gospel of St John. The first is in chapter ii, verse 12, where we read that Jesus was accompanied by his mother and brethren as well as by his disciples; apparently having been persuaded by them to return into his own country. Nor is this at variance with the other passages (John, vii, 3-10) where his brethren advise him to display his wonderful works in Judæa, and show himself to the world. This is evidently suggested in ridicule: "For neither did his brethren believe in him"—is the explanation given by the writer, and when his brethren went up openly to the feast of tabernacles, Jesus, having declared that he would not go up with them, afterwards went up secretly.

These accounts can hardly fail to leave on the mind of the reader an impression not favourable to the worship which, in a much later age than that of primitive Christianity, was extended to the Virgin Mary, and has been continued even to our own times by a large branch of the Christian Church. Such inferences, however, need only to be slightly touched on in this work, nor need we dwell long on the conflicting notices of the other women, several of whom bore the name of Mary, which occur in the early Christian history. Many of these appear to have attached themselves to Jesus, and to have followed him about in a manner that cannot be considered otherwise than remarkable. We have this on the authority of St Luke:

And it came to pass afterward, that he went throughout every city and village, preaching and showing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God; and the twelve were with him, and certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils, and Joanna the wife of Chuza Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered to him of their substance. [Luke, viii, 1.]

With the exception of Mary Magdalene, who stands out and is named rather prominently among them, it is impossible to distinguish or to identify the various women who

bore the name of Mary; and in our received English translation the insertion of words in italics, purely on conjecture, has really had the effect of deterring enquiry from a subject which is by no means capable of being brought to a satisfactory conclusion. Next to Mary Magdalene may be named the sister of Lazarus and Martha, "a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus's feet and heard his word," (LUKE, x, 39-42). These lived at Bethany, and are named also in St John's Gospel, where we read that

> It was that Mary which anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick. [JOHN, xi, 2-20.]

The full account of this incident is related in John, xii, 1, as having happened six days before the Passover, but it is not supported by the testimony of St Luke, in whose gospel the feast and the anointing occur in the house, not of Lazarus, but of a Pharisee.

> One of the Pharisees desired him that he should eat with him: and he went into the Pharisee's house, and sat down to meat. And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment, and stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment. [LUKE, vii, 36.]

In order to reconcile the two narratives, we must hold either that Lazarus was a Pharisee, and Mary Magdalene was his sister, or that there were two women who were sinners, and that the incident occurred twice—which is hardly to be believed; especially as St Matthew and St Mark, using almost the very same words (showing that the two narratives flow from some common source), agree indeed in fixing the incident at Bethany, but ascribe it to one Simon a leper, and to a woman whose name is not given.

MATTHEW, XXVI, 7.

Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, there came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head as he sat at meat.

MARK, XIV, 3.

And being in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; and she brake the box and poured it on his head.

Certain of these same women occur again as visiting the sepulchre after the resurrection.

MATTHEW, XXVIII, 1.

In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first *day* of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre.

LUKE, XXIV, 1-10.

Now upon the first *day* of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre. . . . It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary *the mother* of James, and other *women that were* with them, which told these things unto the apostles.

MARK, XVI, 1.

And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene and Mary the *mother* of James, and Salome, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him.

JOHN, XX, 1.

The first *day* of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.

In the Acts of the Apostles we find another Mary, who perhaps had not joined the society of the Christians during the life of Jesus. She is named in connection with the narrative of Peter's escape from prison, when he took refuge in her house; and she is there described as mother of John surnamed Mark, who perhaps may be the same as Mark, the reputed author of the second gospel, although some professing to be critics have endeavoured to find traces of a Roman origin in that gospel.

And when he had considered *the thing*, he came to the house of Mary the mother of John, whose surname was Mark, where many were gathered together, praying. [ACTS, xii, 12.]

Still another Mary, of whom we know nothing, occurs in the Epistles, where St Paul sends a salutation to a woman bearing that name at Rome.

Greet Mary, who bestowed much labour on us. [ROM. xiv, 6.]

Of the brothers* of Jesus—Judas, James, Simon, and Joses—few words are required. The names are common to others who figure in the early Christian history, and James is the only one of the four who appears, and that rather prominently, after the crucifixion of his brother—if, at least,

* It appears from the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius (i, 7) that the relatives of our Lord were called *desposunoi*, that is "children of the (*despotes*) master."

he is the same who afterwards is called the first bishop of Jerusalem, and if also Judas and Joses are in no wise connected with others of that name who also are mentioned in the brief histories of those early times. They will recur to our notice in a future chapter.

There remains one more person supposed to have been of the Holy Family, who must now be mentioned. The names Cleopas and Cleophas occur, the former in St Luke's gospel (xxiv, 18), the latter in St John (xix, 25). Cleopas is named as one of the two disciples who were on their way to Emmaus when Jesus joined them, and having expounded to them the Scriptures, vanished out of their sight. Cleophas, on the other hand, is named only as *the husband* of Mary, one of the women who stood by the cross of Jesus when he was crucified. The passage has already been quoted in page 154 of this volume: but it will be observed that as the word *wife* is in italic print as not being found in the original Greek, it is by no means certain whether that Mary was the wife or the daughter of Cleophas; nor must it be passed without notice that the margin of our Authorized version and the text of the Revised version read Clopas instead of Cleophas; and thirdly, it is very suspicious that the Mary, whose identity is thus doubtful, is described in the same text as sister to our Lord's mother, and that according to this narrative two sisters were both called by the name of Mary.

To explain these difficulties the Fathers of the Church have put forward various explanations equally unsupported by any authority, and have left the original narrative as uncertain, but fortunately as harmlessly uncertain, as it was before. Whether Cleophas, Cleopas, and Clopas were or were not varieties of the same name, is a matter of no importance to History or to the Church. Others reject the identity of the two, asserting that Clopas is a Hebrew name, equivalent to the Greek Alpheus, of which we shall have to speak hereafter, whereas Cleopas is of Greek formation, being in fact, as we are told, an abbreviation of Cleopatros, as Lucas is said to be from Lucanus, and Antipas from Antipatros.

The son of this Clopas is said by Hegesippus (see p. 84) to have been appointed second bishop of Jerusalem on the death of James the Just.

In the reign of Domitian some of our Lord's family, grandsons of his brother Judas, were still surviving, and were pointed out to their unbelieving neighbours,

as being of the royal race of David. We are informed by Eusebius (iii, 20), on the authority of Hegesippus, as already quoted in this volume, that the emperor, fearing the coming of Christ, as had formerly been the case with Herod, caused two of these descendants of the ancient Israelitish sovereignty to be brought before him. Being interrogated on the subject, they confessed their lineage, and when asked what amount of property they possessed, they said that they possessed nine thousand denarii between the two, and that this was not in money, but was the estimated value of thirty-nine small measures of land, from which, after paying the taxes, they maintained themselves on what remained. Their hard and horny hands witnessed the truth of what they said: and when they were next questioned about the expected coming of Christ, and his kingdom, they declared that it was a heavenly and not an earthly kingdom which they looked for, and that it would begin at the completion of the age (*epi sunteleiā tou aiōnos*), when Christ would come in glory to judge the living and the dead, and would render to every man according to his deeds. This statement, coming from such a source, may be reasonably supposed to have excited nothing but contempt in the minds of those who were present. The emperor dismissed the simple peasants, satisfied that no danger could arise to his sovereignty from such humble revolutionists; and he immediately gave orders to stop the persecution which had been begun against the Christians throughout the empire. This account, taken from Hegesippus, whose words are quoted in page 83 of this volume, must be received for what it is worth; for some who do not profess to be critics, have classed it with the other legends which were so plentiful within an hundred years of the crucifixion.

It is not to be denied that other names than those which have here been given are mentioned in Eusebius as well as in other writers, and even in the New Testament itself; but their connection with the Holy Family is so obscure and inconsistent with itself, that it is dangerous to go beyond the statement of three Gospels that there were four other sons of Joseph and Mary besides daughters, and that they were brothers and sisters of Jesus Christ.

To this account of the family of Jesus it may be interesting to the English reader to know some other particulars concerning the name itself, which appears in the Scriptural books written in the Greek language without any notice of

the Hebrew name from which it is derived. There is, indeed, even among intelligent Christians much ignorance, or at all events much indifference to the fact that the very name Jesus is not of Hebrew, but of Greek origin, as indeed is the whole history of his life related in the four Gospels which form the early part of the Christian Canon. No one but those who have a previous theory to uphold, can believe that the people of the Holy Land, or at all events of Jerusalem, in the time of Christ, spoke any other language than that spoken by their Hebrew forefathers, modified of course by such causes as will be found to have acted in the case of other nations during the period of perhaps many hundred years since they became a separate and united people.

From the nature of the Hebrew language, in which each word is formed of fewer letters than in any of the modern, or even many ancient, tongues, it is also much more difficult to ascertain the correct pronunciation of it, since it has ceased to be spoken as a living tongue; and it has been the unavoidable result that the pronunciation of Hebrew has become different in almost every country of the world. The Greeks were never verbal critics, and those who translated Hebrew names have affixed to them Greek terminations, by which they were more easily read by their countrymen, although this very thing would make it difficult to distinguish between two names that were slightly different in Hebrew, but would become the same in Greek when the same termination was affixed to both.

Of all the Hebrew names which have been translated into Greek or Latin, none has undergone a more thorough change than Joshua. Wherever it occurs in either of the classic languages, it is rendered Jesus, and this rendering has, in certain passages, much obscured the comparison instituted between the champion Joshua, who led the Israelites into the promised land of Canaan, and Jesus, the spiritual leader, who guides the new Israel into their heavenly inheritance. In our authorized version the name Jesus has rightly been retained according to the Greek in all those passages where Christ is designated; but there are three other passages where our Lord is not the subject of the narrative. In two of these the reference is to the great captain Joshua.

[*The tabernacle*] which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles, whom God

drave out before the face of our fathers, unto the days of David. [Acts, vii, 45.]

For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. [Heb. iv, 8.]

In both these places the Hebrew name Joshua might properly have been substituted; and those who lately revised the New Testament throughout, have, with more success than has attended some others of their alterations, substituted for Jesus the name of the Hebrew captain.

But there is a third passage in the New Testament where a missionary preacher of the Gospel and companion of St Paul is mentioned, and where it would seem highly unbecoming to retain a name identical with that of the great master.

Aristarchus my fellow-prisoner saluteth you, and Marcus sister's son to Barnabas (touching whom ye received commandments: if he come unto you, receive him;) and Jesus, which is called Justus, who are of the circumcision. [Col. iv, 10-11.]

Here, however, the Revisionists, with singular inconsistency and in apparent defiance of pious feeling, have retained the classic form of Jesus.

From these let us pass to other instances of the name Jesus applied to other men not named in the Sacred Scriptures. It will be a matter of surprise to many that no less than fifteen, living most of them at the time of the Christian era, are named by Josephus as bearing the name of Jesus.

1. The earliest of these was Jesus, the son of Josedek, a high priest: he was himself also a high priest at the time when the Jews freed themselves from their Macedonian conquerors. (Joseph. *Antiq.* XI, iii, 10; iv, 1.) The name, although plainly written Jesus here and elsewhere in Josephus, is in this place rendered Jeshua in the English translation of that author.

2. Jesus, surnamed Jason, son of Simon, high priest of the Jews in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Simon had three sons, Onias, Jesus who took the name of Jason, and another Onias, surnamed Menelaus. All the three became high priests in turn after their father. (*Antiq.* XII, v, 1.)

3. Jesus, son of Phabet, was high priest in the reign of Herod the Great, who deprived him of his office, that he might confer it on Simon, whose daughter he married. (*Antiq.* XV, ix, 3.)

4. Jesus, son of Sie, was made high priest by Archelaus in the room of Eleazar, who was still living. (*Ant.* XVII, xiii, 1.)

5. JESUS, son of Damneus, made high priest by King Agrippa, on the deprivation of the former high priest Ananus. (*Ant.* XX, ix, 1.)

6. JESUS, son of Gamaliel, was made high priest also by Agrippa, when his predecessor Jesus, son of Damneus, was deprived of that office. (*Ant.* XX, ix, 4.)

7. JESUS, son of Sapphias, one of the high priests, was chosen by the Jews as one of their generals for Idumæa, in the disturbances which took place at the beginning of the war against the Romans. (*Wars, &c.*, II, xx, 4.)

8. JESUS, son of Shaphat, was leader of a band of robbers. The similarity of name leads one to think that this Jesus was the same as the last-named Jesus, as appears also from Josephus, who identifies them in his Life. There is great obscurity in this, as also in other parts of Josephus's writings. (*Life*, xii, 22, 37; *Wars*, III, ix, 7.)

9. JESUS, "the eldest of the high priests next to Ananus," speaks from the wall of Jerusalem to the Idumæans, and is afterwards killed by them together with Ananus. (*Wars*, IV, iv, 3; v, 2.)

10. JESUS, son of Ananus, a plebeian, who in the last days of the siege walked through the streets, crying out "Woe to Jerusalem, woe!" and at last exclaiming "Woe to myself also!" was at the same moment struck dead by a stone from the engines of the besiegers. (*Wars*, VI, v, 3.)

11. JESUS, son of Gamala, is named as one of the high priests with Ananus. Perhaps he is the same as the son of Gamaliel, if we may judge from the similarity of name. (*Life*, 38, 41.)

12. JESUS, a high priest, who with another high priest named Joseph deserted to the Romans. (*Wars*, VI, ii, 2.)

13. JESUS, a priest and son of Thebuthis.* He gave some of the valuable things belonging to the Temple, over the wall, into the hands of the Romans. (*Wars*, VI, viii, 3.)

14. JESUS, unknown save through his son Elymas.

15. JESUS, surnamed Barabbas.

Of this last-named Jesus it will be necessary to add a few words.

During the trial of Jesus before Pilate, there was at

* The uncommon name Thebuthis or Thebuthi is found in a fragment of Hegesippus, extracted in this work (p. 84) from Eusebius, iv, 22. In that narrative Thebuthis would seem to be a Christian in name, although of a doubtful and dishonest character: there were certainly many half Christians at the time of the siege in Jerusalem.

Jerusalem a notable prisoner called Barabbas, who had headed an insurrection among the people and had committed murder in the insurrection. We are told that the governor, willing to keep up a custom, of which otherwise we know nothing, of releasing to the people a prisoner whom they would, asked of the multitude,

"Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas or Jesus which is called Christ?" [MATT. xxvii, 17.]

The latest critics, who have published revised editions of the Greek Testament, Fritzshe and Tischendorf, read in this place "Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ," and they do this on the authority of many cursive manuscripts which read *Iēsoun ton Barabban*. It must be confessed that this addition, however startling to the English reader, renders the passage more complete; for the word Barabbas means the son of Abba, and we do not meet with many such patronymics without some name of the individual prefixed. Thus Barnabas is not described by this single word until he has been previously named Joses, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles (iv, 36), where it is said that the more well-known name of Barnabas was given him by the apostles, and thenceforth he is nowhere again called Joses, but only Barnabas. See also Barsabas hereafter.

But we have other proof that the reading Jesus Barabbas is not summarily to be rejected; it occurs in no less than twenty-one Greek manuscripts, as remarked by the Editor of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and there is a marginal note of which the following is a literal translation.

In some very ancient MSS, which I came across, I found Barabbas himself also called Jesus, so that in these the question of Pilate ran thus: "Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?" For, as it seems, Barabbas, which is interpreted "Teacher's son," was the robber's sirename.

This note is ascribed by some to Chrysostom, and by others to Anastasius of Sinai; but earlier than either of those writers is Origen, who, writing at the end of the second century, has the following statement.

Whom will ye that I release unto you, Jesus Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ? In many copies it is not contained that Barabbas was also called Jesus, and perhaps rightly, that the

* London, 8vo. 1879 page 141.

name of Jesus may not be suited to any of the unrighteous. For in such a great multitude of Scriptures we know of no Jesus who was a sinner, as we find in other names of righteous men, so that unrighteous men also are found of the same name, as for instance the apostle Judas Zelotes and Judas [Judah] the patriarch, and Judas Maccabæus, all praiseworthy men—but Judas the Traitor! [ORIG. *in Matthæum.*]

The writer of this paragraph is of opinion that the heretics must have inserted the name of Jesus in this passage to throw discredit on the Gospel history; but this explanation cannot hastily be admitted; the Armenian version, which was made 200 years after the time of Origen, and also the Jerusalem Syriac, still have the words "Jesus Barabbas," and it is more likely that the ecclesiastics of the early church omitted the word from respect to our Lord, who bore that name, than that the heretics should have inserted it. It will be found that words more easily drop out of books, especially such as are written by the hand, than they are introduced, whether intentionally or not, into places to which they do not belong. It will also be remembered by those who attach reverence to the name of Jesus, that it is nothing more than the Greek form of Joshua, and has derived its sacred character from being limited in its present use to our Lord alone.

There is an anecdote related by Philo the Jew in his short treatise against Flaccus (§ 6), which is thought to present a great resemblance to the account of our Saviour's treatment before his crucifixion, and the name of the man who is the subject of it is very nearly the same as that of the robber Barabbas.

There was a man named Carabbas, who was mad, not of a wild and savage madness—for that is unconsidered both to those who have it and to those who come near to them—but of a mild and more gentle kind. This man used to spend day and night naked in the roads, caring nothing for either heat or cold, and was a butt for all the children and idle young men. They drove this man up to the gymnasium, and raising him in the air so that he might be seen by all, they stretched a piece of byblus wider and put it on his head for a diadem, and wrapped the rest of his body in a ground-mat instead of a cloak, and then seeing a short piece of the indigenous papyrus that had been cast by the road-side, they gave it him instead of a sceptre. Thus when he had received these marks of royalty, as they do in theatrical representations, some young men bearing staves on their shoulders stood as lancers on both sides of him, imitating hal-

berdiers. Then others advanced, some as about to do him obeisance, others to plead before him, and others again to treat with him about public business.

It is not to be wondered that in almost the earliest days of Christianity, when the events which are recorded in the gospels had become matters of history, and no longer of living witness and experience, the family of Jesus should be enquired into by a large number of zealous men belonging to the Christian community. Not only, however, are zealous Christians likely to have turned their attention to such an enquiry, but we cannot doubt that evil-minded men, bent upon either gain or notoriety, and other objects, flooded the world with a mass of spurious writings, under the names of the Apostles and even of Christ himself, of Joseph, and of the Virgin Mary; whereas even in the canonical scriptures, all these are seldom mentioned, in deference to the great teacher beside whom their insignificance does not merit a line of explanation. Of these spurious works it would be needless to speak were it not that a great number of them have been published, and whilst they furnish to some a groundwork from which to assail the truth of the genuine Scriptures, they do on the other hand furnish to others a test by which to ascertain the true method by which those Scriptures are to be interpreted. To enlarge on this subject would demand more time than can here be allowed to it; our object is to refer briefly by name to the writings of this kind which are open to those who desire to read them.*

1. The reputed father of Jesus was Joseph the carpenter. There is a tract which has been often published, entitled *Historia Josephi fabri lignarii*, "History of Joseph the Carpenter," in which Jesus is the narrator; he is represented telling his disciples, as they were sitting on the Mount of Olives, the history of his own parentage. It will be sufficient to give one section of this, translated from the Latin, which itself is a translation from the Arabic, and it is not unimportant here to notice.

There was a man named Joseph, by birth a Bethlehemite, of the

---

* The most critical and authoritative edition of these writings is that of Tischendorf, in three volumes: (1) Evangelia Apocrypha, (2) Acta Apocrypha, (3) Apocalypses Apocryphæ, 8vo, 1853-1862. His edition of Epistolæ Apocryphæ, which would complete the series, has not yet appeared.

A convenient edition of most of these, including others not contained in Tischendorf's, is Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, &c., ed. J. A. Giles 8vo, D. Nutt, Londini, 1852. In one or the other of these two are contained all the extracts quoted in the present work.

city of Judah and the state of David the king. He being well instructed in science and learning, became a priest in the temple of the Lord. Moreover he was crafty in the carpenter's art, and after the custom of all men, married a wife. He also begat for himself sons and daughters, to wit four sons and two daughters. Now these are the names of those: Judas, Justus, James, and Simon; the names of the two daughters were Assia and Lydia. At length the wife of the righteous Joseph died, intent on the glory of God in all her works. But that righteous man, Joseph my father according to the flesh, and husband of Mary my mother, went away with his sons to his business, practising the art of a carpenter.

The whole narrative which follows is intended to soften down the Scriptural account of the birth of Jesus by the introduction of details which have in the canonical history been wisely omitted; and it has evidently been the design of the writer to remove the children of Joseph from all brotherhood with Jesus, by representing them as born from a different mother who died before the marriage of Joseph with the Virgin Mary. In the fourth century, when this tract is supposed to have been written, it had perhaps become nccessary to fill a void in orthodox sentiment which had escaped notice 200 years from the time when the four gospels were set forth in writing.

A second class of Apocryphal writings touches on the history of the Virgin Mary. There are two or three gospels of the Nativity of the Virgin combined with a gospel of the Infancy of Jesus: there are letters said to have passed between her and Ignatius, besides other tracts containing the most absurd and audacious fictions about her, whose very name has been kept by one of the four evangelists from the knowledge of his readers, whilst the other three have observed a respectful silence on all such points as were not immediately connected with the life and teaching of her son.

A single example of the spirit in which these fictions have been written, may be given from the Gospel of the Nativity.

When the course of three years and the time of weaning was completed, they [*her parents Joachim and Anna*] brought the Virgin with offerings to the Temple of the Lord. Now there were round the Temple fifteen steps of ascent according to the fifteen gradual psalms: for because the Temple was built on a hill, the altar of burnt offering which was outside could not be approached save by steps. On one of these then her parents

placed the little Virgin Mary, and whilst they were putting off the garments which they wore on this journey, and were clothing themselves according to custom in better and cleaner garments, the virgin of the Lord went up all the steps singly, without the hand of any one to lead and lift her, so that you would think that, in this matter at least, nothing was wanting to adult age.

Whilst these fictitious histories were circulated and believed among Christians during many hundred years, it is scarcely to be wondered that even our Lord himself was said to have left writings behind him, and that such letters have been preserved. Such are some letters which he is said to have written to Abgarus, king of Edessa, in answer to a letter from that monarch, who asked to be healed of a disease. This letter has been preserved by Eusebius, who, although too enlightened a man to believe in its authenticity, has nevertheless, by its insertion in his history, dealt a blow to his own reputation as an honest writer, from which it never can recover. The following extract will suffice as a specimen of this intentional and audacious forgery.

Blessed art thou who hast believed in me, never having seen me. For it is written concerning me, that those who have seen me will not believe in me, in order that those who have not seen me may believe and live. But as to what thou hast written that I should go to thee, it is necessary that I fulfil here all things for which I was sent, and after fulfilling them, that I should be so taken up to him that sent me. And when I am taken up, I will send to thee one of my disciples, that he may heal thy malady, and give life to thee and those with thee.

CHAPTER XIII.

The Twelve Apostles—The Seventy.

That Jesus Christ, in the very first days of his preaching, chose twelve men to attend on him in his missionary labours, and to carry on those labours when he should be taken from them, has mostly been admitted both by the advocates and by the opponents of the Christian religion. But whilst the latter have taunted the new sect with the meanness, the ignorance, and the low estate of the disciples and their immediate followers, the zeal of advocates has represented this very fact as a proof of their divine mission, which alone could enable such weak and humble agents to establish the grand and peaceful institution now existing in every country not only in Europe, but of the world. We read that when the gift of tongues first displayed itself, the people cried out, "Are not all these which speak Galileans?" (Acts, ii, 32), and the meaning which this gives us points clearly to the opinion that those who displayed this gift were ignorant, uneducated men, as well as aliens from the pure blood of the Jews—which alone might doubtless in the minds of many be a sound reason why such men should be ignorant and uneducated. It has, indeed, been suggested by an attractive writer,* who has done his best to harmonize the miraculous with the historical, that the disciples, having witnessed the Resurrection of Jesus, were inspired with great zeal to carry on the work of preaching the Gospel; but this suggestion is followed immediately by the statement that they were encouraged on the same ground to look for the fulfilment of promises, among which it is hardly to be doubted that the second and immediate coming of Christ was not faintly pointed out.

The apology of Justin Martyr, in which we find hardly a trace of the individual apostles, nevertheless contains some pertinent remarks on the social position of the whole body, and we have in the Acts the statement that the sect of the Christians, who, it seems, were at first named Nazarenes,

* Farrar's Life and Work of St Paul, vol. i, p. 84.

were everywhere spoken against (Acts, xxiv, 5; xxviii, 22). The name of Nazarenes still adhered to the Christian community long after the time of Justin Martyr, although I am not aware that the name occurs in his works. He speaks of the social position of the apostles as follows:

Twelve men went forth from Jerusalem out into the world, and they were ignorant men, not able to speak: but by the power of God they signified to all the race of men, that they were sent by Christ to teach all men the word of God; and so we, who before were slayers of one another, not only do not wage war against our enemies, but confessing Christ, die with pleasure, that we may neither tell lies nor deceive those who enquire of us. For that saying,

"The tongue hath sworn; the mind remains unsworn,"

might have brought us back to that [our former state]. (*Apol.* I, 39.)

Barnabas, one of the so-called Apostolical Fathers, but who lived an hundred years later, goes beyond Justin in disparaging the character of the twelve apostles. His words are here given, but they contain an accusation which is not sustained by what we read in the four gospels and elsewhere.

When he chose out his own apostles who were about to preach his gospel, being lawless beyond all sin (*huper pasan hamartian anomōterous*), in order to show that he came not to call righteous men, but sinners, he then manifested himself to be the son of God. [Barnabas, *Epis.* v, 9.]

St Paul himself in his First Epistle to the Corinthians alludes without doubt to the unlearned class of men who formed the early church.

God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty. [I Cor. i, 27.]

The writer of the Acts of the Apostles has left us a most significant witness to the character of the apostles when they appeared before the authorities at Jerusalem.

Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men, they marveled; and they took knowledge of them, that they had been with Jesus. [Acts, iv, 13.]

In the work which Celsus wrote against the Christians, and which would have wholly perished had not the cele-

brated Origen preserved several passages of it in his Refutation of that famous adversary, the author speaks of the Christians in much the same style as some modern writers have used in describing the action of low irregular teachers and socialists among the ignorant vulgar.

We see also that those who set forth and collect the most vile things in the markets, never will come into an assembly of sensible men, nor dare to show forth to them their wares; but wherever they see young lads and a crowd of domestic slaves, and a multitude of ignorant men, there they both push themselves in and glorify themselves. [ORIG. *c. Cel.* iii, 50.]

Such as these, Celsus wishes his readers to understand, are the tactics of the Christian teachers; and Origen undertakes to refute these views. We are not, however, bound to accept either the low estimate which Celsus forms of their honesty or that which Origen would substitute of their integrity, but only the opinion that the early Christians were not superior in learning to the most uneducated classes.

In another part of the same work (vi, 7) we have the indirect testimony, not of Celsus, but of Origen himself, to the lowly and uneducated condition of the early preachers of Christianity.

Consider whether it is not altogether unworthy of belief that Paul, the tent maker, and Peter, the fisherman, and John, who left the nets of his father, have handed down to us such things about God, from having misunderstood what is said by Plato in his epistles.

We here more than elsewhere regret the loss of the work which Celsus wrote; for whilst many other critics have professed to find traces of Platonism in the New Testament, and especially in the writings ascribed to St John, we should have been glad to read the exact words of the man who probably was the first to detect any latent similarity between the doctrines of which we are speaking.

A passage also is quoted by Cave in his Historia Literaria, which refers to the first preachers of Christianity as uneducated and ignorant men.

Messala, V.C., being consul at Constantinople, by order of the emperor Anastasius, the holy gospels, as having been written by unlearned [*idioticis*] evangelists, are censured and corrected. Signed by Victor, bishop of Tunis. See Cave's Hist. Liter. vol. I, p. 415.

The list of authorities for proof that the apostles were ignorant and unlearned men, to all appearance wholly unable to write the several books which form the Greek Testament, might be extended to a much greater length, but shall be here concluded with an extract from the Recognitions ascribed to Clement of Rome, in which Peter speaks of the apostles as follows :

Thus we argued and bore witness; and we, who were unlearned men and fishermen, taught the priests concerning the one only God of heaven ; the Sadducees concerning the resurrection of the dead ; the Samaritans concerning the sacredness of Jerusalem (not that we entered into their cities, but disputed with them in public) ; the Scribes and Pharisees concerning the kingdom of heaven ; the disciples of John, that they should not suffer John to be a stumbling-block to them ; and all the people that Jesus is the eternal Christ.* [*Recog.* i, 63.]

It has been handed down by tradition, and has been accepted by Christians from very early times, that at least five of the twelve disciples who first followed Jesus during his ministry, wrote eleven out of the twenty-seven books which now form the volume of the New Testament, with the further belief that the other sixteen books were written by men who were contemporary with the twelve disciples, and were as well qualified to write what now appears under their names as if they had themselves followed Jesus when alive. Of these books the four Gospels have already been investigated both by the author of this work and by others with more or less success, according as the investigators have either followed the same mode of enquiry which has been deemed proper in the case of other books, or have made a reservation of judgement in the case of our Scriptures, from a feeling that they have the privilege of partial, if not entire, exemption from the mode and the results of such an enquiry.

As this exemption cannot be conceded here, it is necessary to enquire into the lives and histories of the twelve disciples, as far as we can trace them, seeing that all who have written about the wonderful career of Jesus of Nazareth, and the revolution which his doctrines have wrought in so large a part of the world, can have no other written evidence than that of those men who followed him

* The Church of Christ was gathered not from the Academy and the Lyceum, but from the vile common people. (JEROME, Preface iii to Galatians.)

wherever he went and witnessed the wonderful deeds which he performed.

And such an enquiry will begin with the very first notice which we find of them in either the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, or the other writings which follow these in our canon. Not the least remarkable point in their history is the mode of selection by which it appears they were invited to give up their worldly occupations and to accompany their master into almost every part of Palestine; nor is it less wonderful that so many women should have followed him about—if not in all, yet in several of his journeys through both Galilee and Judæa. Let us then compare the various statements in which is recorded the first entrance of the disciples into the service of Jesus, as this is related by the different evangelists.

It is recorded in the Gospel according to St Mark (iii, 13) that Jesus went up into a mountain and "called unto him whom he would, and they came unto him."

> And he ordained twelve that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses and to cast out devils.

With this agrees St Matthew (x, 1-5), also Luke (vi, 13), and again St Mark in a second passage (vi, 7), where he states as follows:

> And he [Jesus] called unto him the twelve, and began to send them forth by two and two, and gave them power over unclean spirits.

The brevity of these notices seems hardly in accordance with the longer account of the mode in which the disciples were chosen; but that subject will recur hereafter when we speak separately of each individual disciple.

The names of the twelve are given by all the three evangelists, and it may be convenient here to arrange them in parallel columns, that the divergency which exists between the lists may be more clearly seen; as this divergency, however slight and unimportant in secular history, gives no support to the theory that the lists were written by the Apostles themselves. In addition to the lists just mentioned, we have a fourth taken from the Acts of the Apostles, which can hardly be omitted from comparison with the other three, and the comparison between the four will be made more easily in parallel columns.

Matthew, x, 2-4.	Mark, iii, 16-19.
The names of the twelve apostles are these:	
The first, Simon, who is [*was*] called Peter, and Andrew his brother; James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother;	And Simon he surnamed Peter; and James the son of Zebedee, and John the brother of James; and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The sons of Thunder; and Andrew;
Philip, and Bartholomew; Thomas, and Matthew the publican;	And Philip, and Bartholomew; and Matthew, and Thomas;
James the son of Alpheus, and Lebbæus (whose surname was Thaddæus); Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, who also betrayed him.	And James the son of Alpheus, and Thaddæus; and Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed him.

Luke, vi, 13-16.	Acts, i, 13.
Of them he chose twelve, whom also he named apostles;	They went into an upper room, where abode
Simon, (whom he also named Peter) and Andrew his brother, James and John;	Simon (whom he also named Peter) and Andrew his brother; James and John;
Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas;	Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew;
James the son of Alpheus, and Simon called Zelotes; and Judas the brother of James, and Judas Iscariot, which also was the traitor.	James the son of Alpheus, and Simon Zelotes; and Judas the brother of James. [*Judas Iscariot was now dead.*]

That these lists of the twelve apostles are not in harmony one with another is evident from the slightest inspection of this table, but it may be added that the fourth Gospel, that of St John, has no such mention of the twelve as chosen by Jesus to follow him about in his journeyings. We read, however, of Peter and Andrew as disciples of John the Baptist, and of Philip who found Nathaniel, who, because Jesus declared he saw him under the fig tree before Philip called him, at once exclaimed, "Rabbi, thou art the son of God, thou art the king of Israel!"

We read in the same Gospel (ii, 1) that, on the third day after this, Jesus was invited with his mother to a marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, and that his disciples also, of whom no mention has previously been made, were there present. This omission may be considered as of little weight, for the

Gospel according to St John has always been looked upon as of a theological rather than an historical character, and other events more important than the calling of the twelve apostles are there omitted.

There are, however, many incidents in the gospel narrative which show less uniformity of fact than the catalogue which gives the names of the twelve apostles, and we do not find the difficulty lessened by another account which must now be noticed. We read that Jesus appointed another body of his followers, consisting of seventy, with powers and privileges so nearly resembling those of the twelve, that there remains a mere nominal precedence by which the more numerous body is distinguished from the smaller. All that we know, however, of the seventy is told us in the Gospel of Luke (x, 1-20); and whereas the other evangelists have no knowledge of the seventy, St Luke tells us what instructions were given by Jesus not only to the twelve, as do also St Matthew (x, 5) and St Mark (vi, 12), when he sent them out to act as his missionaries, but also to the seventy, where his narrative is unsupported by the other two (Luke ix, 1, and x, 17). St John seems to have been ignorant of these missions, or not to have deemed it needful to record them in his gospel.

There is greater latitude of uniformity in the instructions than might reasonably be anticipated; for if the miraculous and benevolent works of the master were to be imitated and indeed equalled by his followers at so early a period of their discipleship, we might expect that the commission given them would be conveyed, if not in the same words, yet in words which would have the same meaning in all the gospel histories. This expectation, however, is not made good. Let us see how the three evangelists have handed down to us the commands of Jesus on this head. St Matthew and St Mark give them thus:—

Matthew, x, 8.	Mark, vi, 8.
Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils . . . provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves.	He commanded them that they should take nothing for their journey, save a staff only; no scrip, no bread, no money in their purse; but be shod with sandals, and not put on two coats.

Luke, ix, 1.

He called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power

and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases . . . and he said unto them, "Take nothing for your journey, neither staves, nor scrip, neither bread, neither money; neither have two coats apiece."

In these instructions we see what great privileges are given to the twelve disciples, and what provisions they are forbidden to make for their journey. It is in the Gospel of St Matthew that the greatest extension is given to their powers, and the greatest restriction to the things with which they are to be provided. They are in the greater number of manuscript copies of that gospel empowered to "raise the dead," but we learn from Professor Tischendorf's labours on the text of the gospels that a later MS correction of the Sinaitic MS omits this clause; as, however, we know not on what authority it is either retained or omitted, we may be satisfied to know that if the twelve apostles then performed a miracle which even Jesus had not at that time of the ministry performed, we should find it less easy to trust to the historical accuracy of the later narratives. It is sufficient further to point out, and more difficult to explain, that whilst St Mark expressly allows the missionaries to have a staff, and sandals, St Matthew forbids them the use of both these harmless if not necessary instruments, and St Luke, forbidding, like St Matthew, the use of a staff, may seem by his silence to allow the more needful use of shoes or sandals. We nowhere in the latter part of the history read of any report brought to Jesus by the twelve of the result of this their mission. In the case of the larger mission of the seventy we have a narrative apparently more complete than the former, and comprising a result which might seem to wind up satisfactorily the mission to which it is attached.

To this view, however, many objections may be taken. If in the ninth chapter of St Luke's gospel the twelve are dismissed to visit various parts of Judæa, it is in the tenth chapter that similar instructions are recorded as given to seventy other disciples to discharge the same duties.

Carry neither purse, nor scrip, nor shoes. [x, 4.]

With this are joined other admonitions, which speak less for the more amiable side of Christianity and savour more of the asceticism which probably at first did not appear whilst Jesus was alive, but afterwards became so stern in the second and third centuries.

Salute no man by the way . . . Into whatever city ye enter,

and they receive you not, go your ways out into the streets of the same, and say, "Even the very dust of your city which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off against you."

Joined to the maledictions which follow and which are too long to be here repeated, is the report brought by the seventy, who return with joy, saying that even the devils were subject unto them through the name of Jesus (x, 17). There is no incident in the New Testament so difficult to be explained as this double mission of disciples. The powers with which they were intrusted transcend all that are elsewhere recorded, and the fact that there is no mention of their ever having been exercised has suggested an explanation which would much detract from the historical character of the narrative.

It is remarked by the author of the tract which was formerly ascribed to Barnabas, the companion of St Paul, but which probably was written a hundred years later by another Barnabas, that the number twelve was chosen as a testimony of the tribes, seeing that there are twelve tribes of Israel (viii, 3). It is well known that twelve and seventy were favourite numbers in the national history of the Jews, and it is also clear that many incidents related in the New Testament have been moulded by the writers into a shape imitating what we read in the earlier Jewish writings. It would in those days have been thought to be no very serious deviation from truth to range the followers of Jesus under the two classes here described in order to have some foundation for the system of church government which was so soon set up by the early Christians, somewhat on the basis of Judaism; nor is it an objection to this view that Jesus is represented as giving to the missionaries instructions which are elsewhere repeated, when there is no mention at all of any mission, but as applicable to the whole course of their future ministry. It might therefore be contended that one mission only had been instituted, and afterwards expanded into two before these events were set down in writing.

Of the restrictions which were imposed on the disciples, when sent out to turn the people from heathendom to Christianity, we have, indeed, a generally harmonious account, varying in many small details so far as to justify some degree of hesitation in accepting them without examination. But we cannot waive the right of comparing them with the rules which the ascetics of a later date adopted, touching on the same subject, of dress and of personal equipment. Not only the Friars of the Middle

Ages, but possibly the Hermits of the second century, and certainly some monks of the present day, have excited the curiosity and ridicule of the vulgar, whilst inviting the encouragement of the devout, by appearing, some with, some without staves, but without either shoes or sandals. Has the text of our canonical books been interpolated to sanction the doings of these enthusiasts or impostors?

There is great incoherence and what may be termed want of sequence between the various parts of the Gospels, whether historical or didactic. The events which are recorded are so numerous that the account of each is all too brief, and the sayings of Jesus so numerous and so pithy, that it was perhaps needful to give them in a short and compressed narrative. This will not, of course, explain many of the direct contradictions which exist either between one narrative and another, or between different parts of the same narrative; these can only be explained by want of knowledge, although not often by intentional fraud, on the part of the writer. The twelve apostles occupy a large part of the Gospel history whilst Jesus was alive, but during the whole time they appear so little prominent that we could have desired to have some record of their operations whilst they were absent on the missions which have here been described, and the absence of such record suggests that principles of criticism, usual in other cases of a similar nature, should here also be applied. But our present object is not to enter into details of the previous history of our Lord and his followers, but of the later period during which the apostles, or, more precisely speaking, some of them, appear after the crucifixion, when Christianity was making that progress in the world which gained for it the character of a divine dispensation.

Omitting, therefore, all further notice of the previous events and the various acts of the twelve disciples, let us imagine ourselves to be in Jerusalem on the day of Christ's crucifixion, which had been hurried on at such an early hour by the Jewish hierarchy, with the reluctant consent of Pilate, in order to prevent, as it seems, the Jewish populace from interfering in favour of the great teacher, whom only a week before they had escorted with triumph into the holy city. All the disciples, we are told by St Matthew (xxvi, 56), had forsaken him and fled, when he was first arrested, but we learn from the 58th verse of the same chapter that "Peter followed him afar off, into the high priest's palace, and went in and sat with the servants to see the end." St

John also informs us that Peter was accompanied by another disciple, who, being known to the high priest, went with Jesus into the palace. This other disciple is thought to have been John himself, the same John who is supposed to tell the story (although there also he is not named), and who stood with the mother of Jesus and witnessed the crucifixion of her son. Where the others took refuge, we are not informed; but certainly those who not many months before had been sent forth to "heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, and cast out devils," (MATT. x, 8) do not appear to much advantage or act with much boldness at this closing scene of their master's holy life.

All the disciples forsook him and fled when he was arrested, although St Peter, relying on some doubtful words of Jesus, drew a sword and inflicted on one of the high priest's servants a wound which was immediately healed by the interposition of our Lord himself, and the indignation of the soldiers, which would otherwise probably have led to harsher treatment, was thereby avoided. The disciples fled, but we are informed by Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho (106) that they afterwards repented of having done so, and we may readily believe that their flight was brought about by the sudden and unexpected arrest of their master; for we do not find that prophets or apostles, however gifted by Providence with supernatural powers, are exempt from fear, weakness, and other feelings which belong to ordinary human nature.

With the exception of Matthew, Peter, James, John, and Jude, to whom are ascribed some of the writings contained in the New Testament, Philip is the only other disciple named in the ensuing history, and there is some little uncertainty in identifying him, seeing that one of the seven deacons bore the same name, and that certain faint traces of a Philip and his daughters are found in the fragments of some early Christian writers. Of the other six disciples nothing is known beyond certain fictions handed down in later spurious writings, describing their preaching in remote quarters of the world, where, judging from the more trustworthy scriptural accounts, we may be sure they were never seen or heard of.

If the disciples fled from Jerusalem because they feared that they should share the fate of their master, the narrative of St John's Gospel, or rather of the Appendix to it which occupies the twenty-first chapter, would seem to have a

greater claim to be considered authentic than has generally been conceded to it. Where should the fugitives take refuge if not in their own homes and among their own people? What should they do to maintain themselves but resume their former modes of life? This indeed lies at the base of what we read in the twenty-first chapter before named; but in accepting this as a fact, we find ourselves in a difficulty from which it is not easy to be released.

The disciples are again assembled together in Jerusalem, to witness the ascension, which of course must have been later than the interview of Jesus with his disciples in Galilee. We must be content to suppose that the paucity of facts recorded as having happened in the forty days is the cause of much incoherence and even contradiction which appear in our remaining books, or else the return to Galilee must be considered to be unhistorical. The world itself, St John tells us, could not have contained all that might have been written; but this declaration does not make us the less regret that the other writers, as well as St John, did not expand their biographies to a length more suitable to a subject so interesting and so important to the whole human race.

It was in accordance with the direct command of Jesus (Acts, i, 4) that his disciples remained in Jerusalem, awaiting the gift of the Holy Ghost, which he had promised to them. This gift was accompanied, or, as may be thought, was indicated by that remarkable phenomenon, of which enough has been said in a previous chapter of this work, the gift of tongues, and which followed soon after the Ascension. When the disciples had witnessed this last scene of their master's life, and had elected Matthias to fill the place that had been vacated by the treachery and death of Judas Iscariot, they seem to have settled down for good in Jerusalem, and to have lived, at least some of them, in common, having no private property belonging to individuals, but giving all things into the common stock.

> They, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people. [Acts, ii, 46.]

From this time the twelve are very seldom named: they appointed seven deacons to aid them in ministering to the needs of the Christian brethren, but only Peter, John, and James, of the original apostles, are named as having taken

part in any common or private undertaking. And when a great persecution arose after the murder of Stephen, instigated by Saul, against "the church," as it is now called, at Jerusalem,

> They were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria, except the apostles. [Acts, viii, 2.]

The twelve then, it would appear, remained at Jerusalem, constituting themselves a sort of central authority from which missions were from time to time sent to different parts of Judæa, and to which appeal might be made from those who went to preach the Gospel in different countries, or any other reference might be made on the various questions and disputes arising between them and their heathen neighbours. This system was much promoted by the fact, hitherto not sufficiently insisted upon, that the common people of the city had heard Jesus preach, and had witnessed some of his miracles and benevolent deeds in favour of the diseased and the needy. There can be little doubt that the common people who had "heard him gladly," were not indisposed to hear his followers, and this would give them a sense of security from any extreme measures of persecution at the hands of the Jewish hierarchy, their adherents, or the upper classes. This view of the case, supported by the Acts of the Apostles, gives us the strongest possible reasons for rejecting the narratives of the apocryphal gospels and other spurious works, in which the apostles are said to have claimed and divided out the world among them, as their presumed descendants, the popes of Rome, have done in a similar spirit, and each to have taken a district in which they might preach the Gospel. The incomes or savings of Jewish fishermen would have been unequal to bear such a burden, and the faithful in those distant regions would not very soon have become numerous enough to defray their necessary expenses.

That the success of the first Christian missionaries was wonderfully great, has been explained in various ways. The divine aid, working by human means and human agents, would not be wanting; and the spirit of the times, when the system of the Roman religions was becoming effete, helped much to advance their cause. The claim to supernatural powers, which were supposed to form the essential part of the sacraments, would no doubt enlist the zeal of some; nor would the accusation of magic with which they were everywhere taunted, deter them from practising their

peculiar rites as pertinaciously as their enemies, who kept up the old religion. But those to whom these remarks are applicable were not the apostles, who, as is evident from many passages in the Acts (vi, 1; viii, 1; ix, 29; xi, 19-22), remained in Jerusalem.

We may omit for the present the imprisonments and other incidents which befel some of them there. Three only are named, Peter, James, and John; and what happened to them will be best mentioned under the head of each apostle by himself.

There is no work that we know of, having for its subject the history of the twelve apostles, only a spurious work said to have been written in Greek by Abdias, a Jew, whose vernacular name was Obadiah. He was said to have been bishop of Babylon, and his work to have been translated into Latin by Julius Africanus. This, however, cannot be true, for the work was written in Latin by some forger of the tenth century, and no Greek text was ever known to exist.*

* The Latin text is found in the Codex Apocryphus, N.T., edidit J. A. G. 2 vols, 8vo, Londini 1852.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SEVEN DEACONS—PHILIP—STEPHEN—NICOLAS.

The late origin of the various books comprised in our New Testament, and of the Acts especially, supplies a good reason for the uncertainty of dates even more than for the want of agreement about names and facts. As regards the subject of the present chapter, the appointment of deacons, ministers, or servants, to the Christian society, we are told only that it happened "in those days when the number of the disciples was multiplied," and that it arose from the unavoidable neglect with which the widows of Hellenists were treated by the more national Hebraists in what is termed the "daily ministration." It will be remembered that a community of goods is more than once indicated and exemplified in the instances, not the most credible in the apostolic history, of Ananias and Sapphira, but it is by no means to be inferred that the whole Christian community gave up their property into a common stock, although the tendency of Christ's teaching, and, it must be admitted, of his disciples also, was in that direction. There is no doubt that common tables were established in various places; but the very mention of widows being neglected in the daily ministration suggests that a perfect feeling of communism, even if preached, was not fully carried out. It might reasonably be inferred from the Gospel history that the first Christians would very soon establish some mode of giving aid to their poorer brethren, and that this aid was mostly of the kind which is now called denominational, being for the most part limited to the "household of the faith." Nor is this subject unconnected with an opinion—which, however slight, has nevertheless been found to exist—that the practical duties of Christianity were already beginning to be in force before the first preaching of the apostles, both in Judæa and everywhere within the limits of the Roman empire. If this were so, a sixth cause for the rapid spread of our religion might be added to the five which have been so ably set forth by the author of the "Decline and Fall of

the Roman Empire." In aid of the Hellenistic widows, the apostles called together the "multitude" or whole body of Christians resident at Jerusalem, and requested that seven of their community should be appointed to attend to such matters, and that themselves should be left at leisure for prayer and the ministry of the Word.

And the saying pleased the whole multitude: and they chose Stephen, a man full of faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, and Timon, and Parmenas, and Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch. [Acts, vi, 5.]

It is not without significance that all these deacons appear under Greek names. We may believe that the Hellenists (Grecizing Jews) were numerous at Jerusalem, and, as we are told that the deacons were first appointed to rescue the widows of their own order from the neglect with which they were treated, no doubt, by the more Hebraistic Jews, we may imagine that there was already beginning that antagonism which certainly afterwards broke out more fiercely between the old conservative Judaism headed by St Peter—afterwards called Ebionitism—and the Hellenistic or Grecian party, of which Stephen was a member and Paul the leader.

Of the seven deacons five are never again named; only two remain, whose acts require to be here noticed, and one of these, Stephen, if not cut short by an early martyrdom, might have attained to an eminence among the Christians equalled only by that of St Paul himself.

The word deacon, like bishop,* priest, and others, has been introduced into the English language, as indeed into other European languages, with a meaning different from that which it bears in its original Greek form. It is used

* The word *episcopos* occurs five times only in the Greek Testament—Acts, xx, 28; Philippians, i, 1, 2; I Tim. iii, 1; Titus, i, 7; I Peter, ii, 25. In the first of these passages our translators have correctly rendered it 'overseer,' to feed the Church of God; but in the other four the foreign term *bishop* has been used, no doubt for the purpose of elevating the office. In accordance with the title of the officer *bishop* for *episcopos*, so here also the title of the office has been adopted, and what elsewhere would be called overseership has, in ecclesiastical language, been termed bishopric as the proper equivalent for *episcope*, and it is rendered 'bishopric' and 'office of a bishop,' in the two only places where it occurs. [Acts, i, 20; I Tim. iii, 1.]

The word *hiereus* (Greek) is always rendered by *priest* in the New Testament, although this is a corruption of *presbuteros*, the proper meaning of which is *elder*, and is used to denote officers both under the old dispensation and among the Christians.

in all the classical writings, where it occurs, to denote a servant, or attendant, and has no sort of religious character attached to it at all. And it is rather remarkable that the word itself does not appear in the Acts of the Apostles, even in the passage where the institution of the office is related. But in the Epistles of St Paul, and there alone, the word deacon occurs five times as the title of an ecclesiastical official. One of these is in the Epistle to the Philippians (i, 1), and the other four are in the First Epistle to Timothy (iii, 8, 10, 12, 13). In these passages we find rules of life prescribed to deacons, which have less reference to the distribution of meat or money than to a sacerdotal system even then beginning at Jerusalem. That a deacon should be blameless would need no legal sanction beyond the common law of mankind, but that in the midst of a people, among whom polygamy was allowed even from the time of Abraham, it was thought necessary to limit the deacon, as according to another text bishops are limited, to one wife, admits of some explanation. There is no such actual limitation found in the Gospels, although an inference might be drawn not too strictly from our Lord's words; and St Paul also says, "Let every one have his own wife" (I Cor. vii, 2); but this, if construed strictly, would apply as much to laymen as to bishops and deacons, if any then existed. But the restriction of a religious order to such exceptional laws does not result from those ancient examples. It is more probable that this comparative celibacy of the clergy was introduced from Egypt, where, according to Diodorus,

> The priests marry one wife, but everybody else marries as many as he pleases. [*Bib. Hist.* i, 80.]

That this is the origin of the law on which is based the injunction found in St Paul's Epistles, although perhaps not hitherto pointed out, is more than probable, if we consider the long connection which subsisted between Egypt and Palestine. The same condition is imposed on both bishops and deacons, and would have been extended to presbyters also, only presbyters and bishops were clearly the same in the earliest ages of Christianity, and when the former modified celibacy was altered by a more rigid law, all the three orders of clergy were debarred from marriage altogether, until the Reformation restored to them the natural privilege which is common to them with the rest of mankind. It would not have been surprising that this law should have been imposed on the very first teachers of Christianity, if it

had come from any other than St Paul: it would have been more appropriate if delivered at a later date and by any other writer. The custom of every oriental country would have been against any restriction until the power of the Church became so great that none of its laws could be resisted, and this custom has prevailed in all eastern countries, even so far as to have almost driven out the Christian religion from countries where it once was flourishing.

Whilst, however, St Paul alone uses the word to denote a subordinate officer of the church, he mentions neither Philip nor Stephen by name in his epistles at all, either as individuals or as filling the office of deacon. And the confession of complicity which is put into his mouth in his last speech to the people of Jerusalem must be received with that qualification which is due to all speeches found in the works of the ancient historians. That St Paul does not name Stephen in his epistles, is not what we should have expected, seeing that Stephen was in fact a sort of forerunner of St Paul, and preached, if only in outline, those very doctrines which afterwards formed the pith of all Pauline Christianity.

It was the work of a later day to fix on the deacon those duties which have elevated him to the third rank of the Christian ministry, as also it was about the same time that the names of bishop and presbyter, until then hardly to be distinguished from one another, were introduced to denote the first and the second ranks and offices in the new community.

Irrespective of these criticisms, we must review what has been handed down by the canonical writing about the deacons Stephen and Philip, who alone are therein named a second time.

1. Stephen.

The most eminent of the deacons certainly was Stephen; but his reputation flows not through any records of his ministry, whether as a preacher or as a dispenser of charity to Christians who were poor, but has arisen wholly from the tenor of a long speech addressed to the Jewish authorities, when he was accused of subverting the law and the customs of his nation, as Jesús had been not many years before. His previous history, as we read it in the Acts (vi, 8), goes no further than the statement that he "did great wonders and miracles among the people." It is said, indeed, in a preceding verse (7), that "a great company of the priests were

obedient to the faith." But it appears there was a synagogue, if not several, at Jerusalem, consisting of Libertines, Cyrenians, Alexandrians, Cilicians, and Asiatics, who disputed with Stephen, and "were not able to resist the wisdom and the spirit by which he spake" (10). The only course open to these defeated persons, as to most men who get the worst in political and more so still in religious controversy, is to appeal to physical force, backed, if possible, by the law.

The charge which was brought against him has been already cited in page 21, and amounted to what was thought by the Jews to be of a most criminal nature—to change the Mosaic customs. Those who accused him, however, were not the Hellenists, as has been said by some without sufficient grounds, but the bigoted Jews who stuck to the Mosaic law in all its forms and ceremonies. The schism, which afterwards developed itself so rapidly between the Judaizing and Hellenizing Christians, was still in its infancy. Stephen was put to death because he belonged to the reforming party, and he was put to death by the anti-reforming Jews. His appearance before his judges is not related in a manner to give much information to readers: they "saw his face as it had been the face of an angel" (vi, 15).

The trial began in what was probably the usual way. The High Priest asked him, "Are these things so?"—equivalent to asking him to plead Guilty or Not Guilty. But Stephen, ignoring the tenor of his accusation, addresses to the Court a recapitulation of all the events which had happened to the nation from the earliest times to the building of the Temple. In this summary he departs in many particulars from the narrative given in the Pentateuch, and we cannot rest satisfied with these variations, or rather misstatements, as "showing the freedom with which he treated the sacred history, and the comparative unimportance assigned by him, and by the sacred historian who records his speech, to minute accuracy."*

The speech of Stephen contains so many errors of fact, that we are justified in doubting whether the work in which it occurs could have been written by any one who was witness of Stephen's death, or who heard the words of his defence before the people, and possibly before the Sanhedrim at

* This is the view taken of the subject by A. P. S., the writer of the article "Stephen" in Dr. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

Jerusalem. The errors of statement are indeed some more, some less important:

1. He states that Abraham bought a burial-place in Sychem of the sons of Emmor. But it appears from Genesis, xxxiii, 18-20, that it was Jacob who did this, and that Abraham bought the cave of Machpelah. (GEN. xxiii.)

2. He says that Jacob was buried in Sychem, but we read in Gen. l, 13, that it was in the cave of Machpelah.

3. He names 400 years instead of 430 for the captivity in Egypt.

4. He names 75 members of Jacob's family, instead of 70 only. (GEN. xlvi, 27; EX. i, 5; DEUT. x, 22.) Those who try at all risks to harmonize passages that are hopelessly at variance, add, to make up the list, five children of Joseph, who did not form part of Jacob's family at all.

5. Stephen says that Abraham removed from Haran (or Charran, as the Greek text has it) after the death of his father Terah. We learn from Genesis (xii, 4) that Abraham was then 75 years old. But Terah was 70 years old when his son Abraham was born (GEN. xi, 26), and was therefore 145 years old when Abraham left Haran for the land of Canaan. It appears also that Terah did not die till he was 205 years old (GEN. xi, 32). He must therefore have outlived the migration of his son to Canaan 60 years! What other inference, it may be asked, can be drawn from these facts than that the speech of Stephen has been given by the writer of the Acts according to his own notion of what would be the likely tenor of his argument, in the same way as Thucydides has recorded the speeches of statesmen in the Peloponnesian War? But there is this important difference between the two.

Thucydides informs his readers that he has given the speeches as nearly as he could to what the speakers might have said, judging from the information which he had received from others, supplemented by the strong probabilities of the case, of which he, being not a traditional but a contemporary writer, must be allowed to have been a sufficient judge. The speeches as well as other things in the Acts of the Apostles are accepted as verbally accurate and of divine dictation by all pious Christians. But the address delivered by Stephen did not go on peaceably to its end. The past history of the Jews was a less inviting subject than the feuds which agitated Jerusalem in the time of Stephen himself, and he was not interrupted so long as he was speaking of past events. But when he

comes to say, "But Solomon built him an house," and breaks off from his summary, knowing well what really was the offence which he had given, he proceeds as follows:

Howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet, Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool: what house will ye build me? saith the Lord; or what is the place of my rest? Hath not my hand made all these things? Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye, &c. [vii, 48, &c.]

This address, which must not therefore be taken as recorded accurately, but only, like other speeches in history, as suitable to the occasion, was enough to provoke any one, even the members of the Sanhedrim; and it is not to be wondered at that the hearers "were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth." He, however, was undaunted, and

Being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. [vii, 55.]

These words spoken by Stephen were, in the opinion of the Jews, sheer blasphemy, but when we are told that "they ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city and stoned him," we can hardly reconcile this with the supposition that those before whom he appeared were the Sanhedrim, or great council, of the nation. There is more the appearance of a popular disturbance by which the life of Stephen was sacrificed illegally. The incident has passed through the hands of so many commentators, who have proposed so many modes of explaining it, that the sober reader may well be content to receive the narrative in its original form. It may be lawful to remind him that the object of the writer of the Acts is to set before his readers such a relation of those early Christian times as would do honour to the religion and its founders, without much regard shown to details of fact, which would be thought by almost everybody in those days of very secondary importance. St Stephen submitted to his fate, saying, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!" But when it is said that he added, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge!" we are reminded of the parallel words which Jesus used when about to be crucified, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Luke, xxiii, 34). It is an open opinion whether the third

gospel and the Acts of the Apostles were written by St Luke, or, at all events, by the same author; but the similarity of thought in the present case may be taken as one reason for entertaining the identity of their authorship, whoever may have been their author. The most important incident connected with the murder of St Stephen is that Saul, the same who is afterwards called Paul, was consenting to his death. The subject will be resumed hereafter under the head of the Apostle to the Gentiles. St Stephen from this time disappears wholly from the scene.

2. Philip.

The occasion of his appointment has been already given, and it has been remarked that his name, as well as of all the other six, is of Greek origin. The relation, however, of Greek to Hebrew in early Christianity is too vague to allow of any certain conclusions on which other than very general theories might be founded. The only information that we have on the subsequent career of Philip the deacon is found in three passages of the Acts: we will take first the last of these, in which the writer, speaking in the first person at Cæsarea, says:

> We entered into the house of Philip the evangelist (which was one of the seven), and abode with him. And the same man had four daughters, which did prophesy. [Acts, xxi, 8.]

There is some little difference of reading in the original Greek, "which was one of the seven," which might lead a critic to think the clause was of later date, introduced to explain who Philip was, and if so, it might be doubtful whether the Philip at whose house Paul and his company sojourned, and who is here called the Evangelist, was the same whom we now call the Deacon, or the other Philip who was one of our Lord's apostles. In the absence of positive proof, it is nevertheless more than probable that there were two Philips, and that whilst the apostle of that name remained in the obscurity which covers the lives of so many others of the apostles, Philip the deacon, or evangelist as he is called in the extract just made, was the only one of the seven whose acts were thought worthy to be recorded in our canonical scriptures. If, however, the Philip who lived at Cæsarea, being a deacon, was also truly denominated an evangelist, this epithet must mark a preacher and not, as in its usual meaning, a writer of the doctrines and history of Christianity. This interpretation of the name is strengthened

by what is recorded of him in the other passages of the Acts which are now to be cited.

Not long after the appointment of the seven deacons, but how long we are not told, there arose a persecution against the Christians at Jerusalem, and all except the apostles took refuge in flight. This fact seems to prove that Philip the apostle was not the Philip who is termed the evangelist, and who dwelt afterwards at Cæsarea. The apostle, we may believe, stopped at Jerusalem with the eleven; but the other, Philip the deacon, did not remain with them. We read of him as engaged in missionary enterprises, which must have disabled him from giving relief to the poorer brethren, according to his first appointment.

Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them. And the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. [Acts, viii, 5-6.]

It is not surprising that many were converted by his preaching, for he is said to have performed miracles in no degree surpassed by those which our Lord himself performed.

For unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, came out of many that were possessed with them: and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed. [viii, 7.]

It was at Samaria that Philip met Simon Magus, as related in a former page (113), and he also, much to our surprise, as well as the people generally, was baptized by Philip. When the apostles who remained at Jerusalem heard that the people of Samaria had accepted the Gospel, they sent down John and Peter to confirm them in their belief. The charge of the new converts was then taken from Philip and placed with John and Peter, who laid their hands on them—not, however, on Simon—and they received the Holy Ghost. We leave the apostles, who forthwith returned to Jerusalem, and follow Philip.

The angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, "Arise, and go toward the south, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert." [Acts, viii, 26.]

The meeting of Philip with the eunuch, followed by the conversion and baptism of that Ethiopian, resulted from the journey of Philip into the desert. The epithet of evangelist seems in consequence of these doings, both in Samaria and in the wilderness, to have been more suitable to him than

that of deacon. If the other five, when Stephen, the sixth, was murdered, fled like Philip out of Jerusalem, their duty of "serving tables," for which they had been appointed, was perhaps at an end. We left Philip in the desert with the eunuch on the road between Gaza and Jerusalem; but no sooner had the baptism been complete than one of those instances of supernatural agency occurred, which, like the miraculous appearance of our Lord among the disciples when the door was shut, have been a great stumbling-block to the literal interpretation of several incidents related in our canon.

When they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more; and he went on his way rejoicing. But Philip was found at Azotus; and passing through, he preached in all the cities, till he came to Cæsarea. [Acts, viii, 39-40.]

If the dramatic character of all Hebrew literature were allowed to have full scope in modern times, many events which now seem needlessly to partake of supernaturalism might be interpreted in a way which would go far towards removing much of the antagonism between ecclesiastical—even scriptural—history and the deductions of science.

Philip, it seems, returned to Cæsarea, where perhaps he had already been an inhabitant and may have spent the latter part of his life. We are not told that he ever resumed his office of deacon at Jerusalem, where indeed by this time the Judaizing Christians had now established a phase of Christianity, not only not in harmony with the followers of St Paul, but absolutely opposed to the Pauline and predestinarian theory, which set aside Judaism with its circumcision and other obligations, and offered Christianity to all the nations of the world, whom the Jews and also our canonical writers designate by the name of Gentiles.

Here then, in the town of Cæsarea, our summary of Philip's career would end, were it not that he is said, as already stated in a quotation from the Acts, to have had four daughters "which did prophesy." With this, however, the statement made by Polycrates as preserved by Eusebius (iii, 31), and quoted in a former page (92), does not agree; for Polycrates names Philip as one of the twelve, and speaks of three daughters, two of whom were virgins; and Eusebius, in the previous chapter (30) of his Ecclesiastical History, quotes from Clement of Alexandria, that Peter and Philip were married and had children, and that Philip also gave his daughters in marriage to husbands. He also quotes from

Caius, a later writer, who makes Proclus, his antagonist, say that

> There were four prophetesses, the daughters of Philip at Hierapolis in Asia, whose tomb, and that of their father, are to be seen there.

The writer of this had no knowledge, probably, of any other tradition than that found in the Acts of the Apostles; but the incoherencies in the various traditions make it impossible to ascertain the truth at all, and have given rise to the question whether there was more than one named Philip in the early Christian Church.*

3. Nicolas.

As it is not desirable to omit anything which may throw light upon the early days of our religion, and enable us to form a reasonable estimate of the Christian writings, a few words may be added of Nicolas, a third deacon, who, although not again named in the New Testament, is named by Eusebius, quoting as follows from Clement of Alexandria.

> This man, they say, having a beautiful wife, and having been reproached by the apostles with jealousy, after the ascension of the Saviour, led her into the midst, and said that any one who pleased might marry her. [H. E. iii, 29.]

Those who told this disgraceful story of Nicolas, the deacon, were, as Eusebius tells us, the Nicolaitans named in the Revelation of St John, who boasted that Nicolas was their founder; and Clement, as quoted by Eusebius, says that Nicolas consorted with no other woman than his own wife, although we may infer from the sequel of the story that others of that heretical sect, as they are termed, were not so particular. It would have been no loss to Christian literature if the only notice of Nicolas which has come down to us had been buried in the oblivion which perhaps would have been the fate of his supposed followers, the Nicolaitans, had not this discreditable anecdote been preserved. It may also lead to a further conclusion that, although the general character of orthodox Christianity is free from such deplorable cases of depravity, it would equally have been no loss if the numerous heretical sects had sunk into oblivion together with the numerous bulky volumes which have been written about them, whether to support or to impugn their tenets.

* In St Augustine's sermons (266) are notices of the two Philips, partly in harmony and partly at variance with the foregoing particulars.

CHAPTER XV.

§ 1. Andrew.

In the four lists of the twelve apostles, given in page 173, the first-named are Andrew and his brother Simon Peter. The relation between these as brothers is not stated in St Mark's list, nor in that of the Acts of the Apostles, and they are named not forming a pair as in Matthew and Luke, but as forming what we may term a quaternion with James and John, the sons of Zebedee. When, however, Jesus sent out his disciples, two and two, to preach and to work miracles, we may believe that the two brothers were joined together in that mission. Andrew is again associated with his brother Peter, and with the brothers James and John, in asking Jesus privately as he was sitting on the Mount of Olives over against the temple,

> Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when all these things shall be fulfilled? [Mark, xiii, 3.]

This account is significantly expanded in St Matthew's Gospel (xxiv, 3) by the further question, "And what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?" and the questions are there, as also in St Luke's Gospel (xxi, 7), said to have been asked not by the four, but generally by all the twelve apostles.

Andrew is again named, and this time in conjunction with Philip, in the Gospel according to St John (xii, 20), where there is an account of certain Greeks who came up to worship at Jerusalem. This incident, as also a similar conjunction of the same apostles in the feeding of the five thousand, will recur to our notice, under the name of Philip, in a future chapter of this work, and with it is concluded all we know of St Andrew, save what follows respecting his first introduction to the apostleship. In the account of his first meeting with Jesus there is great discrepancy between St John and the other three evangelists. The discrepancy relates to the call of the brothers Andrew and Simon Peter, which in the Gospel according to St Matthew (iv, 18) is thus described:

> Jesus, walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon

called Peter, and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea; for they were fishers. And he said unto them, "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men." And they straightway left their nets, and followed him. [MATT. iv, 18.]

This passage is repeated almost verbatim in Mark (i, 29); but in Luke the narrative is expanded, and more explanatory. Jesus saw two ships standing by the lake of Gennesaret, but the fishermen were on the shore, mending their nets.

And he entered into one of the ships,* which was Simon's, and prayed him that he would thrust out a little from the land. And he sat down, and taught the people out of the ship. Now when he had left speaking, he said unto Simon, "Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught." And Simon answering said unto him, "Master, we have toiled all the night, and have taken nothing: nevertheless at thy word I will let down the net." And when they had this done, they enclosed a great multitude of fishes: and their net brake. And they beckoned unto *their* partners, which were in the other ship, that they should come and help them. And they came, and filled both the ships, so that they began to sink. When Simon Peter saw *it*, he fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord." For he was astonished, and all that were with him, at the draught of fishes which they had taken: and so *was* also James, and John, the sons of Zebedee, which were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, "Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men." And when they had brought their ships to land, they forsook all and followed him. [LUKE, v, 3–11.]

With this narrative the account given in St John's Gospel (i, 35) would seem to be discordant, unless, indeed, we can harmonize them by introducing various imaginary details, in which, from the nature of the case, all the New Testament histories are defective, and, from that deficiency, often contradictory.

Two of those who were disciples of John the Baptist, heard their master indicate Jesus as the "Lamb of God," and they followed him. When he questioned them, "What seek ye?" they replied by another question, "Where dwellest thou?" "Come and see," was his answer, and they

* One of the best emendations made by the Revisers of the New Testament is the substitution of *boat* for *ship* in these passages. The Greek *ploia* may be used for either; but Jesus could hardly have taught the people out of a ship, and the partners could not have brought theirs so readily to assist Peter.

accompanied him to the house, where they "abode with him that day, for it was about the tenth hour." To this is added that "one of the two who heard John [*the Baptist*] speak, and followed him [Jesus], was Andrew, Simon Peter's brother." His name occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. Nor have we any authentic knowledge concerning him in any later writers. Eusebius (*H. E.* iii, 1), living nearly 300 years later, tells us that, according to the fiction in which the apostles are said to have divided out the earth between them, Andrew received Scythia as the scene of his future labours; but other authorities differ on this point. Jerome and Theodoret assign Greece to him, and others Asia Minor. Eusebius, moreover (iii, 25), speaks of some acts of Andrew, John, and others, which had been put forward by heretics and possessed no real value among orthodox Christians. In the latest edition of *Acta Apocrypha*, published by Professor Tischendorf, are included two short tracts, one entitled "Acts of Andrew," the other "Acts of Andrew and Matthias." The former of these presents an argument between a Roman pro-consul and St Andrew, the result of which is that the apostle is crucified. In the latter he is introduced to assist in saving from death Matthias, who was on the point of being eaten in the country of the cannibals [Anthropophagi].

The fragment of another writing is published in Tischendorf's Apocalypses Apocryphæ, under the title "Acta Petri et Andreæ." It appears to be a continuation of adventures which befel the apostle after his departure out of the country of the cannibals.

Papias, in one of his fragments, names Andrew, and seems to imply that he had conversed with one who had seen and perhaps been taught by that apostle. But this writer was held in so low esteem, even by Eusebius, that very little reliance can be placed upon his statements, seeing that he relates only what has been told him by others, and makes no claim to have had any knowledge of the apostles, or, as he terms them, elders, among whom, besides Andrew and others of the twelve, he names Aristion, as one of our Lord's disciples, although Ecclesiastical History says nothing more about him.

CHAPTER XVI.

§ 2. Simon—Peter—Cephas.

The brother of Andrew, named Simon,* was called with him to join the brotherhood of the apostles and disciples of Jesus at the beginning of the ministry. Of this there is little doubt, whether we take the narrative of the three synoptical gospels as given in the last chapter, under the head of Andrew, or that of St John, who gives a very different account of the occasion on which Simon was called to be an apostle.

In that gospel alone is related the interview between Jesus and Nathanael, preceded by a rather vague account of the declaration made by John the Baptist that Jesus was the Lamb of God. It would seem from this that the author of the fourth gospel was not aware that Jesus had been baptized at all; but however this may be, it was the public declaration of John the Baptist which led to the call of the two brothers, as well as of Philip, and perhaps others. When Andrew hears the declaration of John the Baptist,

> He first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, "We have found the Messias," which is, being interpreted, the Christ. And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, "Thou art Simon the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas," which is by interpretation, A stone. [John, i, 41.]

It may be remarked on this extract that the words "which is by interpretation," &c., are not part of the speech addressed by Andrew to his brother, nor of the speech in which Jesus gives the name of Cephas to Simon. They form an explanation of the words Messias and Cephas, which was necessary for Greeks reading books written by Greeks, and probably altogether ignorant of the Hebrew language, to which those words belong. But this passage, which has stood more than three hundred years as it now is, has been

* It is worthy of notice that the name Simeon is found in two or three places where the person meant might seem to be St Peter. Jerome, in his Chronicle, says that both forms are good. So say Geo. Syncellus and the author of the Alexandrian Chronicle. I doubt it; for we have old Simeon who speaks in the Temple, quite a different man and having a different name.

altered in the late revision of the New Testament in two or three particulars, not without interest to those readers who are apt to entertain questions that cannot always easily be answered.

The Greek word rendered stone in St John (i, 41) is *petros*, and is correctly so rendered; but in every other passage of the Greek Testament where this word occurs it is rendered by Peter according to our authorized version, and I believe in every other existing translation. It is evident from the agreement of all the four Gospels* that Jesus added to the original name Simon the surname of Peter, by which he has always been better known; but in the Latin Vulgate the name Petrus everywhere has been adopted to denote him whom they call the prince of the apostles, although *petra* is the only Latin word which is applicable, and that word signifies a rock and not a stone. Our English translators have endeavoured to retain the meaning of the Greek word *petros* in the passage where it first occurs, but to use the proper name Peter in all other passages as the more fitting term for the apostle.

It may be thought that those who have lately taken upon themselves to revise the books of the New Testament have not pursued a course always wise or generally to be commended. They have retained the word Peter, wherever it occurs afterwards, as a proper name representing the original *Petros* of the Greek. But they have struck out the word *stone* from the first passage also, where the word *petros* occurs, and substituted "which is by interpretation Peter"; thereby depriving the English reader of knowing what is the literal meaning of the word. But the case is worse against the change when we consider that the word *petros* as well as the English *peter* had before this no meaning at all of a proper name, and is only used as such by the sanction of interpreters. Our Lord did not use the word *petros* at all. His words were that Simon should be called *Cephas*, and this, too, has come down to us in Greek letters; the Hebrew is *Kifa*. Surely our earlier translators were correct in giving the word its common meaning, stone, in the first place where it occurred. We do not know that Cephas ever before or since was used as a proper name, but we are sure that "Peter" never was so used. The many hundreds who have borne that name have been baptized so in honour of the apostle to whom it was first given significantly of its

* Matt. x, 2; Mark, iii, 16; Luke, vi, 13; John, i, 41.

common meaning, and indicative, whether truly or not, of the character which afterwards marked the career of this apostle.

But, returning to the two accounts which have come down to us of the first call of Peter, they do not seem either of them to furnish sufficient ground for the hasty decision which Peter and the others made to follow Jesus; nor can they well be reconciled, unless many details omitted in both are to be supplied by conjecture.* This difficulty becomes the greater when we remember that the neighbourhood of Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing, was a long way off from the towns of Nazareth and Capernaum, where the scene of Christ's early ministry was laid. It is evident that we have very meagre accounts of the first days of Christ's ministry, as I believe we have none of his infancy and boyhood, notwithstanding the audacious "Lives" and "Gospels" which once were in circulation, and now are published under the well-merited names of apocryphal writings, as the literary curiosities of a superstitious age.

It must, furthermore, be mentioned that the new name given to Simon, whichever that might be, does not rest solely on the authority of St John. The narrative is found in a more expanded form in the first Gospel, where, however, the name Cephas is not given. Mark as well as Luke agrees with Matthew in saying that Peter acknowledged Jesus to be the Christ; but Matthew adds:

> Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona [*i.e.* son of Jona]; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock [*petros*, a stone] I will build my church, &c. [MATT. xvi, 17.]

The writer of this was a Greek, having very little knowledge of Hebrew and no knowledge of the name Cephas at all; and both Mark and Luke have no knowledge of the name; nor does John use it for any other purpose than because he happened to know that it was the original Hebrew word, of which Peter was the translation, better known than Cephas among the Greeks, who, whether by race or by education, formed the large body of the early Christians.

The name of Cephas, however, cannot be passed over without adverting to a tradition which, if true, would go far to weaken, if not to upset, both the narratives which

---

* See the other account of Peter's call in the last chapter under the head of Andrew.

have here been quoted. There are six passages in which the name Cephas occurs in the New Testament, whereas in all others, many in number, the disciple is named Peter. We shall best be able to consider this subject by previously citing the first mention which we find of the name Cephas in any profane author; it occurs in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius.

The names of our Saviour's apostles are clear to every one from the Gospels; but no catalogue of the seventy disciples is anywhere in circulation. One of them is said to be Barnabas, of whom also the Acts of the Apostles have made mention pre-eminently, and no less St Paul also writing to the Galatians. They say that Sosthenes also, who with Paul sent letters to the Corinthians, was one of them. The history is, according to Clement in the fifth book of his Hypotyposes, in which he relates that Cephas also, of whom Paul says, "But when Cephas came to Antioch, I withstood him to the face," was one of the seventy disciples, having the same name with Peter the apostle. [*E. H.* i, 11.]

The information which this passage conveys might cause some difficulty to the full understanding of the career which St Peter is said to have followed in preaching the Gospel. It is not likely that a name not thoroughly descriptive of Peter's character for firmness, and wholly unknown as a proper name in any other book, should have been bestowed in the hasty way which the gospel points out, if another disciple of our Lord, although of an inferior class, should afterwards be found, to whom the name belonged without any such sanction from Jesus. But the testimony of Clement the Alexandrian is allowed to pass without correction by Eusebius, and the force of it cannot be ignored, when, in tracing the career of Peter, we come to the remarkable opposition which certainly took place between him and the apostle Paul, but which, according to Clemens Alexandrinus, lay between Paul and the disciple of a lower class, named Cephas. Another writer also, Dositheus, who is the author of several works partly unpublished, and who wrote about the middle of the third century, says that Cephas was one of the seventy and not of the twelve, and that he became bishop of Caunia in Caria.

It will be enough for our present purpose to refer in few words to the other occasions on which the name of Cephas is used. It is only in the First Epistle to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Galatians that it occurs.

In I Cor. i, 12, are the words, "I am of Paul, and I of

Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ"—indicating those who might be accounted leaders of different Christian parties, and it is not clear why the name of Cephas should be here revived, if it had been superseded by the name Peter more commonly in use among the first Christians.

In I Cor. iii, 22, the writer says, "Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, &c., all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's."

In I Cor. ix, 5, St Paul asks if he has not "power to lead about a sister or wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas."

In I Cor. xv, 5, it is related that Jesus after his resurrection was seen of Cephas.

Galatians, i, 18: St Paul goes up to Jerusalem to see Peter, as in our authorized translation. The Revised Version substitutes Cephas for Peter.

Galatians, ii, 7: Here the gospel of the circumcision is said to have been assigned to Peter.

Galatians, ii, 9: James, Cephas, and John, are here called pillars [*i.e.* of the Church].

Galatians, ii, 11: "When Peter was come to Antioch, I [*i.e.* Paul] withstood him to the face." The Revised Version here also substitutes Cephas for Peter, as also in the next passage.

Galatians, ii, 14: where St Paul also blames the inconsistency of living after the manner of the Gentiles, and yet calling on the Gentiles to live after the manner of the Jews.

It is somewhat remarkable that only three cursory notices of St Peter occur in St John's Gospel, although the connection between the two was prominent on so many occasions during and after the life of their master. The name of Cephas, too, occurs nowhere in the four gospels or in the Acts of the Apostles, except in the passage already quoted from St John. The first occasion when St Peter appears individually was when our Lord, after supper, began with his own hands to wash the feet of his disciples. "Thou shalt never wash my feet," said Peter (xiii, 8), but when told that in such case he would have no part with Jesus, his revulsion of feeling was speedy. "Not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." This is the only mention that St John makes of Peter, until we read further on (xx, 2) that Mary Magdalene, having gone early in the morning on the first day of the week to the sepulchre, ran and told Peter that the body of Jesus had been removed, and Peter, accompanied by another disciple, ran to the sepulchre and found

that what he had heard from Mary Magdalene was true. In the last chapter, concerning the authenticity of which doubts have been raised, and in which are recorded the remarkable proceedings in Galilee after the resurrection, we find that seven of the disciples, among whom Nathanael is included, were fishing on the Sea of Galilee, "which," says the writer, alone of the four evangelists, "is the sea of Tiberias" (JOHN, vi, 1).

Here Jesus showed himself, standing on the shore, to them fishing in the boat. He then asked if they had any food, to which they replied, "No!" but at his command cast their net into the sea and caught that well-known number of fishes, one hundred and fifty-three, which has attained a kind of miraculous notoriety in every country to which the knowledge of Christianity has reached. The disciples who were assembled at the sea of Tiberias, are thus named:

> There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas, called Didymus, and Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee, and two other of his disciples. [xxi, 2.]

It may be observed, as worthy of notice in this list, that whilst Andrew Peter's brother is absent, John, the reputed author of the gospel, is named with his brother not individually, but as the sons of Zebedee, and Nathanael is included among them as one of the disciples. It is, indeed, only in the fourth gospel that Nathanael is named at all, and in that gospel only in one other place, where he is first met with by Philip and brought to Jesus, when, having received a proof of the divine power of Jesus, he declares him to be the Son of God and the King of Israel (JOHN, i, 49). It is not without good ground, therefore, that we look upon Nathanael as one of the immediate disciples of Jesus, according to St John, although he is not named among the twelve by the other evangelists, and St John does not name the twelve at all.

The interview between Jesus and the seven disciples forms the subject of the last chapter of St John. The prominent place is there given to Peter, whose replies to the question which Jesus puts to him, "Lovest thou me?" followed by a hint of the fate which afterwards is said to have befallen Peter, conclude all that we can learn from St John's Gospel concerning him who has been handed down to us as the Chief of the Apostles. We may express some surprise that he who had been chosen more than once, with two others of the disciples, to attend on our Lord in some most re-

markable scenes of his life, should in his writings take so little notice of his companions, and not even mention the transfiguration, or the raising from death of the ruler's daughter.

A much more ample notice of St Peter is found in the three synoptical gospels; for his first call as there related, so different from what is told us by St John, we may refer to our last chapter, where he is associated with his brother Andrew, although in the latter part of the gospel history, and in the writings which follow the gospels, there does not appear to have been much connection between the two. We find him first of all receiving Jesus into his house, where his wife's mother was sick of a fever, and was immediately cured by him. All three gospels relate this miracle with little difference of description. Mark, however, tells us that the house belonged to both Simon and Andrew, and that the brothers James and John accompanied their Lord; and Luke, much to the surprise of observant readers, places this miracle of healing before Peter was called whilst fishing on the lake of Gennesaret (MATT. viii, 14; MARK, i, 29; LUKE, iv, 38). It was in the morning after this that Jesus went out into a solitary place to pray, when Peter and others followed, and said to him, "All men seek thee." Peter is next chosen, in company with James and John, to go with Jesus to the house of the ruler of the synagogue, whose daughter was immediately restored to life. It was here that Jesus used two of the few Hebrew words which have been preserved as having been spoken by him—*Talitha cumi;* and they are accompanied by the interpretation which was required by those who used Greek gospels—"Damsel, I say unto thee, arise" (MATT. viii, 23; MARK, v, 37; LUKE, viii, 51).

From this time it is difficult to arrange in order the miracles and other deeds which St Peter either was invited especially to witness, or witnessed in the ordinary course of his attendance on Jesus. It was perhaps early in the ministry that he essayed to walk on the sea, and, as he might have expected, was sinking when Jesus put forth his hand and caught him. This is recorded in St Matthew's Gospel (xiv, 28) alone, where also we have the only record of the reply made by Jesus to Peter's confession that Jesus is the Christ (xvi, 18), already quoted in a former page. That reply, "Thou art Peter!" may be compared with the corresponding declaration of Jesus recorded by St John, "Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, being interpreted,

A stone" (Petros). But the writer of the first knew nothing of the original word Cephas, which was evidently known to the writer of the last.

The time when this dialogue took place was not far removed from another scene between Jesus and Peter, in which Peter rebukes Christ for speaking forebodingly of his passion, followed by his resurrection the third day at Jerusalem. Jesus replies:

> Get thee behind me, Satan; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men. [MARK, viii, 33.]

The whole of this narrative, as in Matthew (xvi, 28), is found too in the Gospel according to St Mark, in the same words, and aids in establishing the independence of the Greek text and of the Greek writers, free from any supposition of a Hebrew original or author.

The miraculous scene of the Transfiguration is recorded by Matthew (xvii, 1), by Mark (ix, 2), and by Luke (ix, 28), but is not mentioned by John, although he himself, with Peter and James, accompanied Jesus and witnessed the transformation which there took place. Even in the short epistles ascribed to St Peter, the writer mentions the voice which came out of the cloud, "when we were with him in the holy mount" (II PETER, i, 18).

On some occasions we find Peter was chosen by our Lord to discharge certain duties alone, or if in combination with others, he is also named individually, as if enjoying a certain undefined pre-eminence, and he often took the lead among the disciples. It was he who asked whether the parable of his sudden coming was addressed to the disciples alone or to the multitude (LUKE, xii, 41); and when the women visited the sepulchre, Jesus appeared to them and said:

> Go your way, and tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. [MARK, xvi, 7.]

At another time, according to Matthew (xvii, 24), when Jesus was called on to pay the tribute to the Romans, St Peter was directed to take out of the sea a fish in whose mouth money should be found to pay the tax. Some critics have asserted that this incident has been interpolated, and is not a genuine part of the gospel. It were to be wished that it had never been there given, for it is better suited to form an incident of an Oriental tale than of the work in which it now appears.

Peter is joined by Mark (xiii, 3), with Andrew, James, and John, in asking Jesus privately what should be the sign of his next coming; the other evangelists describe all as asking him this question; and Peter, not long before this, had pleaded, in answer to our Lord's condemnation of riches, that he and the other disciples had left all and followed him. (LUKE, xviii, 28.)

We now come to the last supper, and the unhappy prominence which the evangelists give to Peter on that day. Our Lord, whether still in the supper room, according to St Luke (xxii) and apparently to St John (xiii), or after they had retired to the Mount of Olives, as stated by Matthew and Mark, addresses his disciples on the subject of his approaching end, and warns them of their little power to resist temptation. To Peter especially he speaks:

> Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired *to have* you, that he may sift *you* as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren. [LUKE, xxii, 31.]

The application of these words is as plain in the English as in the Greek, but is less noticed by the ordinary English reader. Jesus says that Satan has desired to have YOU—*i.e.*, all the disciples,—but that he had prayed for THEE—*i.e.*, for St Peter.

The boldness with which Peter repudiates all idea of weakness on his part, leads Jesus to reprove him by the sad intimation that before the cock crew (whether once, twice, or thrice, is immaterial) he should deny his Master. Peter repudiated such conduct still more vehemently, and the first two evangelists tell us that all the other disciples repudiated it also. It would be not necessary to quote the command which Jesus gave to his disciples, that whoever had no sword should sell his garment and buy one (LUKE, xxii, 36), were it not that, according to the first three gospels, one of the disciples, when Jesus was arrested, drew his sword and smote a servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear. St John alone says (xviii, 10) that it was Peter who did this, that the servant's name was Malchus, and that Jesus immediately touched the ear and healed it.

But the arrest did not take place in the supper room. They retired to the Mount of Olives, where Peter, James, and John were taken by our Lord apart from the rest of the disciples, and witnessed what is termed his agony in the garden of Gethsemane. He knew what fate awaited him

for the offence which he had given to the Scribes, the Pharisees, and other magistrates of the Jewish people; and this appears clearly from the whole tenour of the three synoptical gospels; but no one has yet pointed out how this passive conduct is in harmony with the command that those of his disciples who had no weapons should even sell their clothes to procure them.

The three chosen disciples, however, were unaware of the urgency of that hour: they fell asleep whilst Jesus, about a stone's cast from them, was praying that, if possible, the cup which he was to drink might pass from him: and it is still more remarkable that St John, the reputed author of the fourth gospel, does not mention that Jesus suffered such agony at all, nor that he himself, with his brother James and Peter, were taken apart from the rest by Jesus to witness what then took place. All the other three evangelists mention it, with very little difference of words or facts (MATT. xxvi, 37; MARK, xiv, 33; LUKE, xxii, 41), save that St Luke does not mention that the three disciples were taken apart from the rest, leaving us to suppose that all were present at the agony.

Jesus was now arrested, and the disciples, forgetful of their bravery, fled, but Peter followed him afar off, accompanied probably by John (xviii, 15).

Within a few hours Peter also, forgetful of his boast that he would die rather than betray Jesus, thrice declared, and at last with an oath, in answer to curious enquirers, that he knew not the man. The cock crew; he came to his better senses, and went out and wept bitterly. With this melancholy fact ends the connection of Peter with Jesus in person, unless we accept as authentic the additional chapter of St John's gospel in which is described the interview in Galilee between Christ and his disciples. The events which are described as happening between the resurrection and the ascension were common to all the apostles, and do not belong especially to the details of St Peter's life. It is in the Acts of the Apostles that we hear of him again, and it is not easy to understand the altered state of men and things which is there presented to us, unless there were other agencies working among the people besides those which are briefly described in the previous gospel history.

The Acts of the Apostles does indeed furnish a picture of all the apostles very different from that which the preceding history presents. This applies, however, to three only of the twelve—Peter, James, and John—for the others appear no

more; and these three—who, during their intercourse with Jesus, acted and spoke like children in all the incidents and conversations which passed between Him and them—come forth now with an energy of character not only remarkable in itself, but successful in arresting the attention of all classes of people in Jerusalem. In an historical enquiry like the present, the object of which is to aid the reader in understanding more thoroughly a book which has come down to us as a record of real, and not of fictitious events, we are not at liberty, however much tempted, to suppose what in any other book might be suggested, that the simplicity and want of intelligence depicted of the disciples in the gospels, was used as a foil to render more striking the character and acts of Jesus. We are more interested in noticing the energy and mental power which they displayed when acting on their own responsibility, and no longer under the guidance of their master. Whilst the disciples were attending on him they are represented as acting in a manner that in the case of others would have been thought the extreme of childishness, and of inconsistency scarcely credible. Those seven who were fishing in Galilee when Jesus appeared to them after his resurrection seem to have been stricken with fear when they saw the hundred and fifty-three great fishes, and were afraid to ask Him, "'Who art thou?' knowing that it was the Lord" (JOHN, xxi, 12); and yet, not long after this, when they were all assembled in Jerusalem, before the Holy Ghost was given, Peter is said to have stood up in the midst of the disciples and called their attention to the fulfilment of prophecy in words which can hardly be supposed to have proceeded from one of those who had been struck dumb not many days before at the appearance of Jesus and the miraculous draught of fishes on the Sea of Galilee. The account there given of Judas Iscariot and of his death, with the quotation from the book of Psalms, certainly belong to the writer of the book (ACTS, i, 16-20), and not to St Peter, although put into his mouth; and it may be thought that all this part of the narrative has been erroneously placed before, instead of after, the gift of the Holy Spirit, which, of course, would have enabled St Peter to know and to speak in words which, where they now stand, appear irreconcilable with all his former life. We are, indeed, prepared to find him acting on all occasions as the spokesman of the twelve. There are, however, certain difficulties in the sudden transference of him and the other disciples from the Sea of Galilee to Jerusalem. It is hardly

to be believed that many, if even some, of the twelve were married and had children, and yet followed Jesus so long as two years about Judæa and Galilee, with a common fund of money, and leading a common life. We can hardly reject the statement of Clemens Alexandrinus, as quoted by Eusebius (iii, 30), who writes thus :—

> Do they also reject the apostles? For Peter and Philip begat children, and Philip also gave his daughters to husbands. [*Strom.* iii, 52.]

In the same work (vii, 63), also quoted by Eusebius, Clemens tells us on hearsay that Peter's wife as well as himself suffered martyrdom in the Christian cause.

> They say that St Peter, seeing his wife led away to death, was delighted on account of her call and her being conducted to her home, and he well called out to her, addressing her by name persuasively and encouragingly, "Let her remember the Lord!"

Of these matters it is not needful to speak; they were unknown, as far as can be judged, until more than a hundred years had passed, and we are safe only when we follow the narrative found in the New Testament itself. We have seen in our analysis of the Acts (page 17) the effect produced by a second address to the people of Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and also by a third, delivered in the Temple, where Peter and John had healed the man who had been lame from his birth. The result of these addresses was that the followers of the apostles increased from one hundred and twenty to three thousand, and afterwards to five thousand, within a space of time which can hardly be accepted, unless the multitude had previously been well inclined towards the new Christian doctrine.

That the multitude were at this time well inclined towards the Christians cannot with reason be denied. The miraculous events, such as the shaking of the place where the apostles were assembled, and the healing power which resided even in the shadow of St Peter, are sufficient, if historically recorded, to account for much in the disposition of the multitude towards those who possessed such command over the course of nature; but the communistic tendency of early Christianity was of much more powerful agency where the people at large were ground down by magistrates and rulers combining extreme superstition with the practice of domestic and foreign tyranny alike.

Enough has been said already in our summary of the book

of Acts about the speeches which Peter is said to have delivered on various occasions up to the persecution and death of Stephen. No reason can be assigned to forbid our belief that until then the Christian teachers were fully occupied at Jerusalem in preaching the Christian doctrine such as it appears in the aforesaid speeches of St Peter, and in the address delivered by St Stephen immediately before his death. These speeches have furnished to German commentators, Baur, Zeller, and others, matter for large and even voluminous criticisms, acute in their inception, but leading to such wide results as would, if accepted in the full, destroy the historical character of our records, and render all criticism about them vain and superfluous. It does not appear reasonable or possible to ignore the book in which the actions of St Peter are recorded, although we learn from other sources, and even from the books of the New Testament itself, that the appearance of St Paul upon the stage of primitive Christianity led to a great schism in the Church, which, although it became dormant at a very early period, has continued almost up to the present day. I refer the beginning of this division in the Church to the times which followed soon after the death of Stephen. The persecution of Christians then led to the dispersal of all except the apostles. This fact would suggest that the goodwill of the people towards the new sect had been somewhat modified, or checked by some irresistible authority. We find a cause of this in the action of him who took a leading part in the murder of St Stephen.

As for Saul, he made havock of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women, committed them to prison. [Acts, viii, 3.]

The Apostles remained at Jerusalem; they were, therefore, not persecuted, and Gamaliel, a leading counsellor of the Jewish party, had spoken in their favour. There was already beginning that reconciliation between Judaism and Christianity which has left its mark on so many of the Christian doctrines even until the present day. Such amalgamation, however, must go on gradually. Meanwhile "they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word" (viii, 4). Among those who went was Philip the deacon, whose brief history and preaching in Samaria we have already noticed, as also that Peter and John were sent down, on what has been generally termed missions, by the Apostles who remained in Jerusalem. In this we see the

first beginning of episcopal, or perhaps metropolitan power, which has since been omnipotent in the Church, and of which we find marks in many uncanonical books also, especially in the Recognitions and Clementine Homilies hereafter to be reviewed. The professed object, or at all events the result, of this mission was that Peter and John prayed for them, and laid their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost. This was, indeed, a result of much magnitude in the action of the first teachers; and it retained its efficacy for many hundred years, until in later times it has been understood to have less a material and more of a supposed spiritual effect on the individuals on whom the successors of the Apostles lay their hands.

After his interview with Philip, and his humiliation of Simon Magus, Peter did not return direct to Jerusalem, but preached the Gospel at other places on his way thither. Among the other incidents which are recorded, is the healing of Æneas, wrought by the Apostle in the course of these missionary travels, but it is not stated what period of his ministry this occupied.

And it came to pass, as Peter passed throughout all *quarters*, he came down also to the saints which dwelt at Lydda: and there he found a certain man named Æneas, which had kept his bed eight years, and was sick of the palsy. And Peter said unto him, "Æneas, Jesus Christ maketh thee whole: arise, and make thy bed." And he arose immediately. [Acts, ix, 32-34.]

The fame of Peter now spread to Joppa, a town on the sea-coast of Judæa, and nine miles from Lydda. In that town dwelt a woman named Tabitha, which means in Greek Dorcas, and in English a gazelle. She is in the Acts termed "a certain disciple." We will give the narrative in the words of the Acts.

This woman was full of good works and almsdeeds which she did. And it came to pass in those days, that she was sick, and died: whom when they had washed, they laid *her* in an upper chamber. And forasmuch as Lydda was nigh to Joppa, and the disciples had heard that Peter was there, they sent unto him two men, desiring *him* that he would not delay to come to them. Then Peter arose and went with them. When he was come, they brought him into the upper chamber: and all the widows stood by him weeping, and showing the coats and garments which Dorcas made, while she was with them. But Peter put them all forth, and kneeled down, and prayed; and turning *him* to the body, said, "Tabitha, arise." And she opened her eyes; and when she saw Peter, she sat up. [Acts, ix, 36-40.]

That St Peter should raise any one from the dead during the time that he was visiting these outlying districts of Judæa is one of the most astounding facts in the early Christian history, and would challenge some degree of incredulity, were we not assured in the Gospels that the twelve apostles were endued by Jesus with power to perform such miracles when he sent them forth to preach during his own life. There is, however, a great likeness between the mode which Jesus followed in raising to life the Ruler of the Synagogue's daughter, and that of Peter in the case of Dorcas. In both cases all who were present are put forth, and Peter, as well as Jesus, is left alone. The word, too, used is very nearly the same. Talitha, used by our Lord, differs by one letter only from Tabitha used by Peter. The former is interpreted to mean the common name Damsel, whereas the latter is said to be the proper name of the deceased woman. Such questions as arise about these narratives are more easily asked than answered. That all witnesses were, both by Jesus and by Peter, sent out of the room in which the miraculous raising was performed, was consistent with the whole course of Christ's ministry, and is stated by St Peter himself to have been exemplified in the appearances of Christ himself after the crucifixion.

Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly, not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God. [Acts, x, 40-41.]

Whether any witnesses were present or not, we cannot well explain how the woman Dorcas, whose death was known to so many, widows and others, could have again shown herself alive without creating greater excitement among the people than is recorded in any writing of that superstitious age.

It is to be presumed that Dorcas was of Jewish birth, for we are told that those who were scattered abroad after the persecution of Stephen "preached the word to none but unto the Jews only" (xi, 19). St Peter would naturally follow the same course, until he returned afterwards to Jerusalem.

During his stay at Joppa, which is described as lasting many days, he lodged in the house of a namesake, "one Simon, a tanner" (ix, 43). But his services were now wanted at Cæsarea, which was the seat of the Roman governor. In this city was stationed a Roman cohort, called the Italian, and its centurion was named Cornelius. He is described in the Acts as

A devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people and prayed to God alway. [x, 2.]

This man, whom the writer of the Acts has thus described, is otherwise wholly unknown in history, and yet one might suppose that what is related of him would come to the knowledge of those with whom he was associated, and be mentioned by those who have written about those times. He is said to have been visited by an angel, who came to him "about the ninth hour of the day," which was three o'clock in the afternoon, and told to send men to Joppa and bring thence Peter, who should tell him what he ought to do. There are several questions to which we should like to find answers, but to which, from want of facts, no answer can be given. Cornelius was a Roman military officer; but was he a convert to Judaism? He could hardly have been otherwise, if he prayed to God alway. No Roman centurion could openly profess a religion which set aside all the other religions and forms of worship that prevailed throughout the Roman empire. And yet we can hardly believe that he was a Jewish convert. It remains then to infer that the episode of Cornelius was one of those small events which arise among the lower classes of people, aided here and there by the adherence of some one of higher pretensions, but not of sufficient notoriety to attract the attention of the public, or of any one beyond the narrow circle of those among whom it happened. But what befel St Peter is much more elaborately told. The day after the vision—for it was in a vision that the angel appeared to Cornelius—whilst the two messengers were on their way to Joppa, Peter went up on the house-top, as was customary, to pray about the sixth hour, which was twelve o'clock at noon.

And he became very hungry, and would have eaten: but while they made ready, he fell into a trance, and saw heaven opened and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth: wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, "Rise, Peter; kill, and eat." But Peter said, "Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean." And the voice spake unto him again the second time, "What God hath cleansed, that call not thou unclean." [x, 10-15.]

It is said that this was done thrice, and that the vessel was received up again into heaven; but we are not told

what it was that was done three times; we must therefore suppose that the voice repeated the same words three times, but it may also be inferred that Peter remained in a trance —that is, asleep—until the whole vision was completed. The object seems to have been that Peter's mind might be prepared for the visit to Cornelius, who would without doubt offer him food after a journey of many miles from Joppa to Cæsarea. St Peter had not ceased to think about the vision—or dream—which had been shown to him, when "the Spirit said to him," now no longer asleep, "Three men seek thee." He accordingly went down from the roof of the house, and after some conversation and questioning with the messengers, he accompanied them to Cæsarea, and was introduced into the house of Cornelius. Here he was received with adoration by the centurion, who "fell down at his feet and worshipped him," taking him for a divine being (reminding us of what afterwards befel Paul and Barnabas in the town of Lystra) (Acts, x, 25; xiv, 11). St Peter then, as St Paul did afterwards, declared that he was a man like those who heard him, and that he had come, as he had been invited, to instruct him and others in the truth of the Christian doctrine, with which the world had already become acquainted since the time of John the Baptist, adding, moreover, that he had now discovered that God was no respecter of persons, but would admit to his presence all who worked righteousness out of every nation in the world. But another miracle followed.

While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. [x, 44.]

They were all then baptized, and Peter, having at their request tarried among them certain days, returned to Jerusalem, from which city there is no scriptural authority for believing that he ever afterwards departed. The manufacturers of ecclesiastical legends have not failed to make use of the conversion of Cornelius to form a chapter of their apocryphal writings. He is named in the Menologium Græcum (i, 129) as having wrought miracles; and Jerome, in his book against Jovinus (i, 301), says that he built a church at Cæsarea, whilst others in a later age say that he became bishop of Scamandria.

When St Peter again came forward in the capital of Judæa, he found himself in a different position from that which he held in the country districts. The national bigotry of the Jews had already spread among the Christians,

"They that were of the circumcision contended with him," having already heard that he had preached the Gospel to the Gentiles. It must not be thought that those who so contended were purely Jews, as of old; Christianity now comprised a large number of the Jewish rulers, although we have no authority for believing that they had altogether assumed the name of Christians, as was done soon after this time at Antioch. St Peter found himself obliged to meet an accusation respecting his conduct at Cæsarea. His opponents brought a charge against him,

Saying, "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them" [xi, 4].

In reply St Peter defended himself by recounting the visions which he had seen and the command which he had received through the angel, and he winds up his address by asking, "What was I that I could withstand God?"

When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life" [xi, 18].

This question, then, having thus, as it seemed, been amicably settled, it might be thought that Peter and the other apostles would be allowed to follow their vocation and preach without hindrance to the people. But there was in Judæa another authority with which the Christians had to reckon. This was Herod the king, who about this time "put forth his hand to vex certain of the Church" (xii, 1). In doing this Herod was most probably supported by some of the Jewish rulers, who had not listened to the doctrines of the reformers. We have briefly seen in the summary of the Acts (p. 24) that after St James was put to death, Herod arrested Peter also, and put him in prison, intending after Easter—*i.e.*, the Passover, which was then being kept—to bring him forth to the people. We are left to guess with what view Herod did this, whether to enlist the people in favour of his measures against the Christians, or to punish Peter in defiance of their good-will. The latter view seems the most probable; for the king delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him, and Peter was bound with two chains and lay between two soldiers even whilst sleeping in the prison. He was, however, again released, a second time by the agency, it is said, of an angel, who roused him from sleep, shook off the chains with which he was bound, and led him out of the prison. We read that Peter

Wist not that it was true which was done by the angel, but thought he saw a vision. When they were past the first and the second ward, they came unto the iron gate that leadeth unto the city, which opened to them of his own accord: and they went out, and passed on through one street; and forthwith the angel departed from him. And when Peter was come to himself, he said, "Now I know of a truth, that the Lord hath sent his angel, and hath delivered me out of the hand of Herod, and *from* all the expectation of the people of the Jews" [xii, 9-11.]

It is interesting to follow Peter when he left the prison. He went late at night to the house of one Mary, the mother of John, who was surnamed Mark, and probably is the same to whom is ascribed the second gospel in our canon. When he knocked at the door, "a damsel came to hearken, named Rhoda:

"And when she knew Peter's voice, she opened not the gate for gladness, but ran in, and told how Peter stood before the gate. And they said unto her, "Thou art mad." But she constantly affirmed that it was even so. Then said they, "It is his angel." But Peter continued knocking: and when they had opened *the door*, and saw him, they were astonished" [xii, 14-16.]

That Herod should put to death the keepers, who were supposed to have allowed Peter to escape, is quite consistent with the tyrannical character of the king and of tyrants generally; but it is equally true that the angel of the Lord, who set the prisoner free, might be held accountable for such a flagrant act of injustice, if we receive the narrative as, word for word, a true description of facts, and, according to French idiom, *au pied de la lettre*. From this inference we can only be released by supposing that man's agency here served to effect the will of God. That Herod sought for Peter and found him not, seems to point out that the common people took part with the apostle; and it may with equal likelihood be supposed that his rescue from prison was brought about by the intervention of friends, whose agency was afterwards wholly ascribed to the intervention of the Almighty. In this case, to punish the keepers by death was no greater excess of tyranny than has often been practised among nations further advanced in civilization than the Jews of the first century.

King Herod withdrew to Cæsarea, where he shortly afterwards died of a foul disease; and about this same time St Paul was converted on his way to Damascus, and so left the coast clear at Jerusalem for the energetic preaching of Peter

and the other apostles, none of whom had left that city either at the death of Stephen or at the persecution which Herod afterwards so briefly practised, and so thoroughly without success.

Meanwhile, it would be easy for St Peter to prove that it was himself in human form, and not "his angel," whatever that might mean, who had been knocking at the door of Mary's house, and now showed himself before them; but the narrative in the Acts informs us that when Peter had explained to them the circumstances of his wonderful delivery, he departed unto another place, *eis heteron topon*, having first told his hearers to "Go, show these things unto James and to the brethren."

We may here raise a doubt whether these events have been recorded in the strict order of time. For we read in the second verse of the same chapter in which the release of Peter is recorded as a later event, that

> Herod killed James, the brother of John, with the sword: and because he saw that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also.

Although, therefore, our summary of events has been made in the order which is observed in the book of the Acts, it seems difficult to explain how Peter could ask those whom he met in Mary's house to go and tell James and the brethren how he had been released from prison. There need be no doubt of the truth that Peter was imprisoned and James beheaded by the command of Herod.

It is possible to imagine that the James to whom Peter sent his message was another James, and not the brother of John, and son of Zebedee, who alone has hitherto appeared under that name in the Acts of the Apostles. There was another James among the twelve, the son of Alpheus, and there was James, the "brother of the Lord," but neither of these occurs to our notice in any other events that happened in these early days; and it is more probable that the writer of the Acts, bent more upon the miraculous events on the one side, and the persecutions of the Church on the other, has neglected that accuracy of time and place which is so important to establish the truth of history.

Notwithstanding this difficulty, it is evident that when the author of the book of Acts was writing, a certain form of Church government is indicated, and that James appears somewhat as acting the part of a bishop, taking the lead of the others, even of St Peter. It will be more appropriate

to defer this question until a future chapter, in which all that we know of St James will be related.

Whilst St Peter was engaged in these conflicts at Jerusalem, St Paul, dwelling at Antioch in the society of certain prophets and teachers (xiii, 1), was busy in various parts of Asia preaching and converting the Gentiles, who more immediately fell in his way. But the division of duties which was soon to be made between him and Peter was now beginning in a way which did not forbode a period of uninterrupted calm. Paul's career was suddenly interrupted.

> Certain men which came down from Judæa taught the brethren *and said*, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." [Acts, xv, 1.]

This declaration, coming from Jerusalem, confirms the opinion that many of the Jews had now joined the Christian society, and that in return the Christians dwelling at Jerusalem had conformed to the Jewish rites, and so laid the foundation of that Judaic school of Christianity of which the Christian Church still bears many undeniable marks. Whether Peter also conformed to the practices of the Jews, although probable, cannot for certainty be said. The emergency was so pressing in the eyes of the Gentile Christians at Antioch, that Paul and Barnabas were sent up to Jerusalem to confer with the apostles on this matter. When there had been much disputing, Peter, with that impulsiveness which marks his character, but was so little sustained by his later acts, rose up, and reminded his hearers that he himself had first preached the Gospel to the Gentiles a long time before, and that God through him had given to them the Holy Ghost as well as to the Jews. Why, then, should a yoke be placed on their shoulders which themselves and their fathers had been unable to bear? (xv, 10.) We cannot doubt that Peter was at this time dwelling at Jerusalem, and was regarded as one of the leaders of the Christians to whom the delegates from Antioch were sent.

St James, however, whichever it might be of those who bore the name, was even now regarded, and not St Peter, as the head of the new society, and rose next to address the meeting. "Men and brethren," said he, "hearken unto me." He then quotes a passage from the prophecy of Amos (ix, 11), varying much in words from the Greek Septuagint, but agreeing therewith sufficiently to denote

the passage from which it is taken. The prophecy is to the effect that God will build again the Tabernacle of David, and that both Jews and Gentiles shall seek the Lord. The result of his advice is that chosen men of their own company—"namely, Judas surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren"—shall accompany Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, and settle the dispute which had arisen between the Christians of that city and those agitators who had come down from Jerusalem and created strife among them. From this time Peter disappears from the historical narrative of the Acts, and we find his name occurring only in the Epistles, as will in due course be noticed.

Nor is there any other source from which we can get any further information concerning the life of this apostle, although there is a long series of adventures connected with his name, which for many centuries have been looked upon as authentic, but are now wholly rejected, and banished to the region of Romance—and of Rome.

We will then proceed to enquire whether the two epistles found in our canon, and other writings ascribed to St Peter, are his genuine works, or must be regarded as the product of the early Christians, availing themselves of his name in order to render those writings acceptable to their community.

The Epistles of St Peter.

The name of Peter has been so prominent among the Christians of every age, that, if he had written nothing, to make use of his name would suggest itself to many in an age when it was thought lawful to ascribe works to authors who had not written them; and whilst James and John have lost in more modern times the equal share of popularity which they seem to have enjoyed at first, the name of Peter is still reverenced in at least half Christendom, whilst the other half have perhaps given the pre-eminence to the name of Paul, whose more extended travels spread his fame to countries where the other disciples, confined to Judæa and mostly to Jerusalem, could only have become known much later. It is, therefore, not to be wondered that the writings which have come down to us, ascribed to the other three apostles, and also the short epistle of St Jude, should altogether amount to much less than half of those which are attributed to St Paul alone.

We must, therefore, examine the writings which in the New Testament are ascribed to the apostles here named, and first of St Peter, whose life and actions we have been

briefly reviewing. Two epistles have come down to us under his name, and they are addressed, the first to the elect sojourners dispersed in Pontus and several other countries of that which is commonly called Asia Minor, the second to those generally who had the same faith as Peter and others who were with him. In the former the writer styles himself Peter only, in the latter Simon Peter. He sends the first epistle by Silvanus, who is described as a faithful brother; but as those to whom it is sent are scattered over a large tract of country and over many provinces, it must be supposed that Silvanus was instructed to travel from one to the other, and to read in each of these countries the contents of the letter with which he was charged. The place from which St Peter dates his first epistle can only be inferred from the following salutation:

> The church that is at Babylon elected together with you, saluteth you, and *so doth* Marcus my son. [I Peter, v, 13.]

From these words it would appear that Peter had left Jerusalem, and taken up his abode in Babylon. Nor is this an unreasonable inference, for the whole testimony of writers immediately following the apostolic age is that Babylon was a place of much resort for both Christians and Jews who retired from the city of Jerusalem. It has been attempted, indeed, to show that by Babylon was meant Rome, and the words just quoted from the epistle have been used to confirm the tradition that St Peter went to Rome, where, with St Paul, he is said to have been put to death. This, however, is wholly unsupported by evidence, and has every kind of probability against it. It is not unusual to stigmatize every city in which depravity exists as a Babylon, but St Peter was not likely to use the name as synonymous with Rome in a serious composition addressed to Christians, and containing admonitions bearing closely upon their way of life and hopes of salvation. We, therefore, may be satisfied that if St Peter wrote the first epistle at all, he wrote it from the city of Babylon, and not from Rome. It is not needful to review all the subjects on which the two epistles of St Peter treat; they are such as might be expected to arise in the mind of a man who was wholly engrossed with a new faith, and had abandoned all the objects of worldly ambition. But the second epistle differs very much from the first in the objects to which he invites the attention of his readers. He foretells that scoffers, walking after their own lusts, shall arise, who shall deny the Lord who bought

them, and deny also that he ever will come again, as already quoted in p. 144 of this volume. The second subject to which he alludes is one which has caused great discussion in the Christian community from the earliest times down to the present. He writes as follows towards the conclusion of the second epistle :

> Account *that* the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation ; even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given unto him, hath written unto you ; as also in all *his* epistles, speaking in them of these things ; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as *they do* also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction. [II Peter, iii, 15-16.]

We shall presently find that a similar censure of St Paul, the point of which is more plainly shown, occurs in the epistle of St James. But St Peter and James are closely connected in other writings of that age, wherein they appear allied in antagonism to St Paul. To speak, however, of St Peter only at present : if he went to Rome, and was there associated with St Paul, both in his ministry and in his death, we should hardly think it likely that he would have cautioned the distant people of Asia Minor generally to beware of the doctrines of a beloved brother with whom he was at the same time so closely associated. But if St Peter went from Jerusalem to Babylon, it is hardly probable that he would have known the epistles of St Paul at all. The censure, also, which is contained in the second epistle against the scoffers and others who denied the second coming of our Lord, would be more appropriate at a later period, when time alone would have shown that the expectation of Christ's coming bodily again on earth had not been fulfilled.

The use of the word "Scriptures" also in this extract throws a doubt over its authenticity : the early Christian writers never describe by this general name any body of writings such as those contained in the New Testament. For at least a hundred and twenty years after the crucifixion the term Scriptures is applied to the Old Testament alone, nor does any other author embody the writings of the New Testament under such a general name, as far at least as I am aware, until Eusebius, since whose time the name has generally prevailed. It has therefore been a question whether we can regard the epistles ascribed to Peter as having actually been written by his hand or at his dictation, in the same way as letters are now written from individuals

to other individuals and communities; or whether these epistles, as well as the others which we shall have to pass in review, have been written in the age next to that of the apostles, as containing their doctrine, of which there was not then and has since seldom been a doubt, but assigned to the apostles in the way that other writings have been assigned to eminent men, so as to form a recognized vehicle by which their doctrines might be conveyed to posterity. There has been less doubt that the second epistle of St Peter is not genuine; Eusebius (ii, 25) reckons it among the books of the New Testament of disputed authenticity, together with others of which notice will in due time be taken. That one of the books contained in our present canon should have been of disputed authenticity in the days of Eusebius, A.D. 320, tells much against it altogether, for it is not likely that it ever had been thoroughly acknowledged before the time of Eusebius; we know, indeed, on the contrary, that it was not acknowledged. Irenæus, as quoted by Eusebius (v, 8), merely mentions one epistle of St Peter; and Origen, also as quoted by Eusebius (vi, 25), in his enumeration of the canonical books, says that Mark, who wrote the gospel, was the son of Peter, and that "Peter left one epistle undisputed. Suppose also the second was left by him, for on this there is some doubt." It would seem, then, needless to proceed further in examining the second of these epistles. We have no reason to doubt that the sentiments therein contained are those of St Peter, but we have a strong reason for holding that it was not written by that apostle. Nor moreover can it be laid down for certain that the first epistle is due to his authorship, although the testimony of Irenæus, Origen, and Eusebius is not against it, yet up to their time, the close of the second century, there is no testimony in its favour. Neither of St Peter's epistles is named in any work earlier than Irenæus, and we are, therefore, driven to form such opinion as may flow from the following observations.

I. No one names the epistles ascribed to Peter until the latter end of the second century.

II. In the first epistle (v, 1) the reader is warned that whilst admonishing elders, the writer himself is an elder, and had witnessed Christ's sufferings. It might be supposed that this was wholly unnecessary in the case of so well known an apostle.

III. The various accounts place St Peter, almost at the same time, in Antioch, Alexandria, Babylon, and Rome;

whereas it appears from the Acts of the Apostles that he lived mostly at Jerusalem, which, indeed, seems to have been the place where all the first disciples resided.

IV. The language in which the epistles of St Peter are written is Greek; whereas St Peter, like the rest of the apostles, was a Galilean Jew of a very humble class, who used the dialect of Hebrew spoken at that time in Galilee, and who, we may say for certain, knew nothing whatever of the Greek language, and, as seems to be indicated in the Acts of the Apostles, never left the city of Jerusalem, save for a short tour in Judæa, from the first establishment of Christianity in that city until its destruction and his removal to Babylon, or more probably his previous death, of which we have no trustworthy account.

V. In the first epistle (iv, 16) the writer says, "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed." In the Acts of the Apostles alone is the word Christian elsewhere to be found. We there read (xi, 26) that the name was given to them, or was assumed by them, first in Antioch; and in the second place where it occurs (xxvi, 28) Agrippa says contemptuously to St Paul, "You are trying to persuade me to be a Christian." It is not easy to see how the name, taking its origin at Antioch, could at so early a date have become a word of common use at a city so far off as Babylon. It was at Cæsarea where Agrippa uses the word slightingly to St Paul, and Cæsarea is not so far from Antioch but that the name might have been spread from one city to the other.

VI. We observe also in these epistles, as indeed in all the books of the New Testament, not only a remarkable similarity in words to those of the Greek Septuagint, but even in whole sentences occurring in the same terms in both. The following examples may be enough to show what kind of argument this is.

1. In I Peter, i, 2, and in II Peter, i, 2, the same salutation occurs: "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you." These words in Greek are copied verbatim from the Septuagint, *Eirēnē humin plethuntheiē*, which words are found in Daniel, iii, 31, and iv, 1.

2. In I Peter, i, 16, "Be ye holy, for I am holy," the revised version of this verse reads, "Ye shall be holy," *esesthe*, instead of *genesthe;* and the accuracy of this new reading is proved by the fact that it is found in all the three passages of the Old Testament in which the words occur—*esesthe hagioi, hoti hagios eimi ego* (LEVIT. xi, 45; xix, 2; xx, 7-46).

3. In I Peter, i, 24-25, "For all flesh is as grass," &c. These words in the original Greek are almost identical with the Septuagint version of Isaiah, xl, 6-8, from which the writer of the First Epistle, ascribed to Peter, undoubtedly has copied them.

There are thirty more verses in the same epistle, in which either words peculiar to it, and occurring nowhere else, are found, such as *adialeptos*, or even combinations of three or more words which hardly could have met together otherwise than as copied from the same source.

4. In the Second Epistle, which is much shorter than the First, the same observations apply. For instance, in II Peter, iii, 3, the expression *ep'eschatou tōn hēmeron*, "in the last days"—never found, that I am aware of, in any Greek writer—occurs in Genesis, xlix, 1; Isaiah, ii, 2, and many other parts of the Septuagint, with the sole variation of *eschatōn* or *eschatō* for *eschatou;* and this same variation is found in the various readings of the Epistle now under consideration.

This comparison of words and sentences occurring in both epistles might be carried to a much greater length, but there is not room for such in this work; but even as far as our quotations have gone, they show us that the writer of these epistles was familiar with the Greek Septuagint, and used it as a book to form his style. Could this be said of Peter, James, and John, dwelling in the city of Jerusalem, amid the most bigoted people in the world, the most exclusively attached to their own country, their laws, their religion, books, and language; and these very men having been looked on by their own leaders as ignorant and unlearned men, and, as such, let go free from the tribunals?

In addition to the Epistles ascribed to St Peter and admitted into the Christian canon, several other works have been handed down under his name. These are so many in number that even Eusebius mentions only to condemn them. But the judgement of Eusebius was tainted with the bias of his age, and his theory of literary honesty not such as would gain him credit in the present day. It may be said without fear that when he doubts the authenticity of a writing, we can hardly fail to accept his doubt as a decisive sentence. When he says he is not aware of any doubt having existed, it behoves his readers to reflect that what has escaped his favouring eye may be revealed to them; but that when he passes a decided opinion against the authenticity of a writing, we may, without hesitation, reject it

as deserving notice only from its antiquity, or as elucidating some point of history or of literature distinct from the object for which it was written. The writings which fall under this class are the following :—

1. The Gospel according to St Peter is slightly noticed by Hilgenfeld in his volume supplementary to the previous editions of apocryphal writings, 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1866.

2. The Acts of Peter and Paul are published in Tischendorf's Acta Apocrypha, 8vo. Lipsiæ, 1851.

3. The Preaching of Peter and Paul.

4. The Acts of Peter and Paul.

5. The Apocalypsis, or Revelation, of Peter.

6. The Two Ways [Duæ Viæ], or Judgement of Peter.

All these last four are found in the supplementary volume of Hilgenfeld, and seem, like other such spurious writings, to have been preserved only to show to what extent fraud or superstition was carried in the first two centuries of the Christian era.

7. An epistle from Peter to James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, is found by way of preface to the Clementine Homilies, and will engage our attention when we are considering Peter's supposed journey to Rome in pursuit of the impostor, Simon Magus.

Whilst these spurious writings have passed current for several centuries, the life of St Peter has formed a subject for the pens of others. There is a tract said to be written by Linus de Passione Petri et Pauli, published in the Patres Orthodoxographi ; also a work under the name of Marcellus de Actubus Petri et Pauli, which elsewhere is entitled De Conflictu Petri cum Simone Mago. It is printed in the Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, edidit J. A. G., 8vo., London, 1852.

It may be added, as of more interest in apostolical than in any profane history, that there were many others who bore the name of Simon besides St Peter, and it is impossible to say whether some of these are not the same persons under different names. We have—

1. Simon the Canaanite, one of the twelve so named by MATTHEW, x, 4, and MARK, iii, 18; but named Zelotes, if, indeed, he is the same, by LUKE, vi, 15, and ACTS, i, 13.

2. Simon the leper, who lived at Bethany (MATT. xxvi, 6 ; MARK, xiv, 3).

3. Simon of Cyrene, who was passing in the street at the time of the crucifixion, and was compelled to bear Christ's cross (MATT. xxvii, 32 ; MARK, xv, 21 ; LUKE, xxiii, 26).

4. Simon the tanner, in whose house Paul lodged at Joppa (Acts, ix, 43, &c.).
5. Simon, one of the four brothers of Jesus (Mark, vi, 3).
6. Simon, father of Judas Iscariot (John, vi, 71; xii, 4; xiii, 2, 26).

CHAPTER XVII.

James, Son of Zebedee.

The history of James and John, sons of Zebedee, is more difficult to trace than that of the two preceding apostles. It is not recorded that any other follower of Jesus Christ bore the name of Andrew or of Peter; and the latter of these names, being an approximate translation of the Hebrew word Kephas, sufficiently distinguishes him who bore the name of Simon from others to whom also it belonged. There are, indeed, several other Simons named in the New Testament, as already stated, but they take no part in the incidents recorded in the Gospels, or in the books which come after them in our canon. The names of James and John, however, are especially prominent in the Gospel History, and it is very difficult to distinguish one from another those who bore the same name as James, the elder of the two sons of Zebedee. There are ~~eight~~ named in the New Testament, bearing this name, and it is difficult to tell whether any of them are the same persons described according to the writer who names them. We have no fewer than three of them among the twelve apostles, but there is no difficulty in distinguishing all of these from the son of Zebedee: he seldom appears as taking any part in the proceedings of Jesus and the disciples, and was put to death so early in the history of the Christians after the crucifixion, that we have no difficulty in identifying him wherever his name occurs, and we may, therefore, defer all consideration of the other seven until we come to the name of the son of Alpheus, named James, about whom all the obscurity is concentrated.

I. The first mention of James and John—for they are generally named together—occurs at the very beginning of Christ's ministry, when, following the example of Andrew and Simon Peter, they left their nets and followed Jesus. We have the authority of Matthew (iv, 21), Mark (i, 19), and Luke (v, 10) for this statement; but the writer of the fourth Gospel not only takes no notice of James and John on this occasion, but in every other case, where their agency is related in the Synoptic Gospels, there is total silence in that which passes under the name of John, and such a fact can hardly be considered as other than adverse to the theory that John, the son of Zebedee, was the writer of that Gospel.

II. These two brothers were chosen especially to accompany Jesus in some of the most remarkable events of his life. We learn from St Matthew (xvii, 1), supported by St Mark (ix, 2) and St Luke (ix, 28), that they were selected, together with Peter, to accompany Jesus into the high mountain, where he was transfigured before them. For what object this scene was enacted we are not told: St Luke somewhat modifies the narrative as related by the other two writers. He adds that Moses and Elias

> Appeared in glory, and spake of his decease, which he should accomplish at Jerusalem. But Peter and they that were with him were heavy with sleep; and when they were awake, they saw his glory, and the two men that stood with him. [LUKE, ix, 31.]

St Luke adds also to the other narratives, that Jesus went up into the mountain to pray; and from this we might infer that the presence of Moses and Aaron had not been foretold, and perhaps even not contemplated by either Jesus or those who were with him.

III. The same three disciples, Peter, James, and John, were also the only ones allowed to accompany Jesus to the house of Jaïrus, the ruler of the synagogue, whose daughter he raised from the dead. The incident is found in all the three Gospels, but, as is the case with so many other important events recorded in the Gospel History, John, selected especially with two others to witness it, does not allude to it in the history of which he is the reputed author.

IV. The same three are again joined together in asking Jesus to tell them privately when the things of which he had been speaking in the Temple would take place. Here also we have only the authority of Mark (xiii, 3) for

ascribing this question to Andrew as well as to Peter, James, and John. In the Gospels according to Matthew (xxiv, 3) and Luke (xxi, 7), it is the disciples generally who ask this question of Jesus; in the fourth Gospel no notice is taken of this incident at all.

V. On other occasions the sons of Zebedee alone, without St Peter, appear as the actors. On their way to Jerusalem, they ask Jesus to grant them an especial honour, hardly justified by the preference shown to them, as we have just related. Their words, recorded by St Mark, are these:

> Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory. [MARK, x, 37.]

But in St Matthew's Gospel (xx, 20) it is the mother of Zebedee's children who asks this favour of Jesus. In both these Gospels the other disciples are displeased, and their indignation, as might fully be expected, "was moved against the two brethren."

The writers of the third and fourth Gospels do not name the request made by James and John. The former of these speaks only of a strife, who should be greatest. This is, however, merely a short mode of introducing the same admonitions which are given in the first two Gospels. In all three Jesus points out that whereas "the kings of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them," this was not to be so among his followers.

> Ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve. [LUKE, xxii, 26.]

These words were addressed to all the twelve, but to James and John a more explanatory answer was given, which in after ages was thought to be a prophecy of the fate that would befal those two disciples.

> "Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" And they said unto him, "We can." And Jesus said unto them, "Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized: but to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give; but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared." [MARK, x, 38.]

It is not without reason that the disciples of Jesus have been always described as ignorant and simple men. It is

clear that in the conversation just related between the sons of Zebedee and the great teacher their views savoured of ignorance, and were directed to a wrong object. The disciples evidently looked to a temporal kingdom—an expectation better suited to the multitude of the Jewish people than to those who for the last year or two had listened to the sublime teaching of Jesus Christ. Whilst, however, it cannot be denied that this vision of a temporal sovereignty was imprinted forcibly upon their mental sight, we might have wished to possess a little more information as to the miraculous powers which were given them when they were sent out to preach the Gospel to their countrymen. That they successfully exercised those powers might be thought to have corrected the sublunary expectations which they showed still to be entertained after returning from their mission.

VI. Among other incidents which occurred during the period of Christ's ministry, there is one related in St Luke's Gospel which cannot fail to arrest the reader's attention, and, indeed, is quoted as of much weight in determining the character of John, the son of Zebedee, as shown in the writings ascribed to him. On their way to Jerusalem, Jesus, with his disciples, passed through Samaria.

> And *he* sent messengers before his face: and they went, and entered into a village of the Samaritans, to make ready for him. And they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem. And when his disciples, James and John, saw this, they said, "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?" But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save *them*." And they went to another village. [LUKE, ix, 52.]

The proposal made to Jesus was certainly not in harmony with his teaching, or with the object for which he came on earth; and has been thought to indicate a harsh feature in the two sons of Zebedee, not so conspicuous in the acts and words of the other disciples generally. It might also be thought marvelous that even James and John could have expected to see fire descend from heaven for such a purpose; for Jesus was not in the habit of performing such conspicuous miracles, and it is more marvelous that even those which he did perform failed generally to secure the belief of the multitude. But, according to the same authority, we have another incident occurring during the

same journey to Jerusalem, in which the agency is limited to John, with no mention of his brother James, who on this account, at all events, may be regarded as acting in subordination to John, although probably the older of the two brothers. The request that fire may be called down from heaven upon the Samaritans is not mentioned in either of the other Gospels. But in Mark (ix, 38) and Luke (ix, 49) we read that it was John whom Jesus reproved because he forbade one who was casting out devils in the name of Jesus. It furnishes a singular commentary on the Gospel history that there should be others than Christ's followers who professed to work miracles in his name.

That it was John only who was reproved by our Lord for checking others who were casting out devils in the name of Jesus, leads us to infer that he alone was answerable for that harshness of character which is briefly ascribed to both of the brothers. It was quite of a piece with the request that fire should be called down from heaven on the hostile Samaritans, and some similar act of bigotry may have earned for them the title of Boanerges, Sons of Thunder, which Jesus gave to them, as St Mark alone tells us in his list of the twelve apostles.

VII. The last occasion on which the three apostles, Peter, James, and John, are especially invited to attend on Jesus, was after the last supper, when the whole party had left the table and gone out into the Mount of Olives. It is described by Matthew as follows:

> Then cometh Jesus with them unto a place called Gethsemane, and saith unto the disciples, "Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder." And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy. [MATT. xxvi, 36.]

The narrative in St Mark's Gospel, xiv, 32, is almost in the same words. In the Gospel according to St Luke, xxii, 39, the name of Gethsemane is not mentioned, nor the names of Peter, James, and John. The same is the case with the fourth Gospel (xviii, 1), in which Jesus is said to have retired after supper, "over the brook Kedron, where was a garden, into which he entered with his disciples."

On the same night the arrest of Jesus followed his retreat into the garden of Gethsemane. All his disciples forsook him and fled. From this time the elder brother, James, disappears for a time from the scriptural account. Peter and John take the lead of the apostles, and James reappears

in the twelfth chapter of the Acts, where, as already related, it is said that he was put to death by Herod, who afterwards arrested Peter also.

It has been suggested also, in the last chapter, that when we read how Peter, on his escape from prison, told those whom he saw in Mary's house to go and tell James and the brethren what had happened, we must suppose that it was not the son of Zebedee, but one of the others named James, who was here meant, and that the James who from this moment appears in the Scripture narrative was either James, the son of Alpheus, or James, the brother of Jesus Christ, as is thought by several of the Fathers, on the authority of St Paul, and also by most modern authors who have wriiten on this subject. If, however, we may suppose that the death of James has been anticipated, and did not occur until after the arrest of Peter, James, the brother of John, may still have been alive in Jerusalem, and that it was he who received the message of St Peter when he escaped from prison.

There is a singular story about this James, quoted by Jerome in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, of which work notice will be taken under the head of St Matthew, who is thought to have copied from that earlier work many of the incidents which he has related in his own Gospel. Jerome says: James had "sworn not to eat bread from the time when he drank the cup of the Lord, until he should see him rising from the dead;" and he adds, as the apparent result of this oath, that "the Lord, when he had risen, gave the linen cloth to the servant, and went to James and appeared unto him." This incident, not named in either of the Gospels, is cited by Mr Nicholson in his work, which he calls the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and is there placed as part of the supposed original text of that Gospel. It is also there remarked that, whilst all the four Gospels relate the attack made by Peter on the servant of the High Priest, when Jesus was arrested, the first two Gospels erroneously name *a* servant of the High Priest, as if there had been more than one. The last two Gospels have *the* servant, and the late revisionists read *the* servant in all four places. It is almost needless to remark that the authority of Jerome is unequal to the task of furnishing credit to so incredible a story.

The early death of this apostle renders it unnecessary to refer to the Epistle which appears in our canon, and of which he could not have been the writer; and of the apocryphal

stories which have been circulated under the name of James, two only, that I am aware of, refer to the son of Zebedee, whereas the name of another James (it is doubtful which of them) has been the subject of legends, litanies, and fictions down to very modern times. The other legend—which may be named as referring, without doubt, to the brother of St John—is a short anecdote of James's death, recorded by Eusebius, who quotes it from Clemens Alexandrinus:

> Concerning this James, Clemens gives, in the seventh of his Hypotyposes, a narrative worthy to be remembered, speaking from traditions earlier than his own time. The man who led him to the judgement seat was moved when he saw him bearing his testimony, and confessed that he himself also was a Christian. Both, therefore, he says, were led away together, and on the way he asked to be forgiven by James. Reflecting for a moment, he said, "Peace be to thee," and kissed him, and so both were beheaded together.

It is not more easy to disprove than to prove the truth of this story, but it may be mentioned that similar legends have been told of other saints who have converted their executionists: nor need we dwell on the alleged connection of St James with Spain, in which kingdom he is worshiped to this day by the superstitious common people—unless we still deem it probable that what is ascribed to the son of Zebedee belongs rather to one of the other James's whom in due course we shall have to name.

CHAPTER XVIII.

JOHN, SON OF ZEBEDEE.

THE second son of Zebedee is the only one among the twelve apostles who bore the name of John, and we therefore have no difficulty in tracing him through the various incidents which occurred during the progress of Christ's ministry, and afterwards, so long as the apostles were preaching the Gospel within the walls of Jerusalem. He was called to be a follower of Jesus, together with his brother James, with Andrew, and with Simon Peter, as already stated in the account given of those three apostles. As his name is not even mentioned in the fourth Gospel, which is commonly ascribed to him as its author, we have no divergent testimony as to the manner in which he first joined the Christian community. There is, indeed, a man named John, who, with Annas, the high priest, Caiaphas, and many others, met at Jerusalem to enquire into the conduct of the apostles, when they were arrested for preaching the new doctrines, as related in the Acts of the Apostles (iv, 6); but this man never appears again in any book of the New Testament. There is a second John, "whose surname was Mark," and who is repeatedly mentioned in the Acts and in St Paul's Epistles as having accompanied Paul and Barnabas on their various journeys, but it is not possible to confound his name with that of John, the son of Zebedee, although he may perhaps be the same as the Mark to whom is ascribed the second Gospel. He is named five times in the Acts of the Apostles: (1) when Peter escaped out of prison and took refuge in the house of Mary, "mother of John, whose surname was Mark" (xii, 12); (2) when Barnabas and Saul, having conveyed relief to the brethren, returned from Jerusalem to Antioch, "and took with them John, whose surname was Mark" (xii, 25); (3) he was with Barnabas and Saul at Salamis (xiii, 5); (4) when Paul, hitherto called Saul, came to Perga in Pamphylia—John, "departing from them, returned to Jerusalem" (xiii, 13); (5) Barnabas took with him this John to accompany him in his travels,

although Paul thought not good to take him, because he had left them in Pamphylia. It was upon this occasion that there was a sharp contest between Barnabas and Paul, showing that in no age of the world can the passions of mankind be wholly eradicated from the breasts even of men to whom have been granted such marvelous privileges as were vouchsafed to the first preachers of the Christian religion.

There is also another John, who appears in later writers, and who is named with great plausibility as a rival candidate with the son of Zebedee for the authorship of the Revelation, and who lived at Ephesus. Eusebius informs us (vii, 14) that a writer named Nepos, who was bishop in Egypt, denied that the son of Zebedee, and asserted that another named John, was author of that book.

We may, therefore, trace the events of St John's life as recorded in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles, without doubting that wherever the name of John alone is mentioned the son of Zebedee is clearly meant. He appears among the disciples who were called whilst fishing on the Sea of Galilee, and is mentioned in all the lists of the twelve apostles, but his name does not occur in the Gospel of which he is the reputed author. There is, indeed, and always has been, a tradition that "the disciple whom Jesus loved," named in four passages of the fourth Gospel (xiii, 23; xix, 26; xx, 2; xxi, 7-20), but nowhere else, was meant to distinguish John, the son of Zebedee; but tradition alone must be answerable for this. We should hardly imagine that our Lord would show partiality to any one of his twelve followers; nor, if he did so, would it be likely that the name of that one should have escaped the knowledge of the others.

It has been vainly endeavoured to trace the lives of the apostles and first preachers, not only through the period of their attendance on Jesus and of their ministry, when he was taken from them, but also back to their previous history, as if any additional glory, beyond that of having been summoned by our Lord, could be derived to them, or advantage to the world, from the knowledge of their birth and parentage. In the deficiency of facts to support such enquiries, the freest conjectures have been hazarded, the most exact texts twisted out of their true meaning, whilst others, which in no way bear upon the subject, have been adduced to confirm them.

A striking instance of this perversion of facts occurs in

a work* which has had a great sale, and is generally of much use from the numerous references which it contains to other works treating of Biblical subjects. It is there stated that the wife of Zebedee and mother of his two sons was Mary, and for this we are referred to Matthew, xxvii, 56 The words of that passage are these :

Among which was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of Zebedee's children.

No words can more plainly show that the mother of Zebedee's children was not the same as the mother of James and Joses, whoever those two may have been. The names in the New Testament, notwithstanding the apparent care with which they are referred to their parents or children, can in few cases be distinguished one from the other, and it is scarcely possible to compare the books together, unless we ascribe to each writer a separate knowledge of the characters, without clear information to guide them from other sources.

The Gospels join the two brothers James and John together, sometimes with Andrew or Peter, in all the transactions of the early part of Christ's ministry; but in preparation for the feast of the Passover, it is Peter and John who are sent into the city, and are there met by a man bearing a pitcher of water, and in whose house they made preparation as they had been commanded. Luke alone gives their names (xxii, 8); Matthew (xxvi, 17) says the disciples generally made preparation for the feast, and Mark (xiv, 13) says two of them, without mentioning their names. This mission of Peter and John may be considered as the first thing which connected these two, as taking the lead in all that was done by the disciples in Jerusalem after the ascension. It is Peter who says to those who were pricked in heart by what they had heard, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts, ii, 38); but the statement which follows, that three thousand souls were that day added to the Christian society, is so extraordinary that we may reasonably suggest that an error of numbering has crept into the text, or that it is the result not of one day, but of a longer time that had intervened. If, however, we may accept this number as correct, we need not wonder that Peter and John ventured to go up into the

* Dictionary of the Bible, article John.

Temple, where they might otherwise expect to meet with opposition, and to preach to those who were there assembled (iii, 1). The healing of the lame man at once brought the people together, but it also brought upon them the priests, the Sadducees, and, what was still more formidable, the Captain of the Temple, a Roman officer, who was not likely to pass over any movement of the people which might end in an insurrection or sedition. It is not recorded that the Captain exerted his authority against the apostles; he appears to have left them in the hands of the high priest and others, until the next day, when they addressed their judges in the same style which they had previously used to the people, and it was then manifest to all that Peter and John were "unlearned and ignorant men" (iv, 13); so they were cautioned and let go free. The result of these two days was that the number of the disciples was raised to five thousand; but it was Peter, and not John, who addressed both the people and the priests: nor does John anywhere appear in the latter part of the history, except in St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, where he is named, with James and Cephas, as one of the pillars of the Church. It may be safely said, then, that so far alone have we any accounts that can be relied on concerning the apostle John; and we turn to the ecclesiastical historian, Eusebius, in the hope of finding something trustworthy, as we might reasonably expect, about him whom Jesus is said to have loved. In entering upon this part of the narrative, we must not forget the last thing we read about them, that they were dismissed by the Jewish authorities as unlearned and ignorant men, and that St Paul, after a few years had passed, speaks of them in anything but a serious tone, as seeming to be pillars of the Church. According to the tenour of that epistle, those two apostles were still at Jerusalem, and do not appear to have left it during the whole life of St Paul. If so, we are unable to understand the change which the character of St John underwent in the intervening years, so that he has been named as the writer of one of the four Gospels, of three epistles forming part of the Christian canon, and of the book of Revelation which forms the conclusion of that canon.

But the silence of Scripture is here supplemented—as is, unhappily, the case with all the early history of the Church—by legends more or less probable in themselves, but all designed to support the system, based on the ignorance of the people, which placed at last the government of almost

all the known world in the hands of the Pope of Rome. The most interesting of these legends, if we were certain of its truth, is that which is told by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History (iii, 23). Omitting much of the needless mass of words with which it is encumbered, the story is this.

When the tyrant Domitian was dead, John, leaving the island of Patmos, came to Ephesus, and from that city visited, when invited, other places in the neighbourhood, to assist them in appointing bishops and ministers, and forming new churches. At one of these places, he saw a young man of graceful and intellectual countenance, whom he at once recommended to the notice and patronage of the bishop.* Having obtained his request, St John returned to Ephesus. Meanwhile the young man was educated, made much of, and at length baptized. After this, the bishop—I use the very words of Eusebius—"relaxed most of his care and watchfulness, as having placed on him that perfect safeguard, the seal of the Lord." Thus freed from restraint, because it was believed that the seal of baptism would preserve him from sin, the young man fell into bad company and rushed into a career of wickedness, going out at night to rob, and indulging in all kinds of expensive revelries. At length, wholly renouncing his religious vows, he formed out of his riotous companions a band of robbers, of which he became the captain, surpassing all of them in violence and cruelty. Some time after this, St John, being sent for to discharge some religious service, said to the bishop, "Come, oh bishop! return to me what I and Christ deposited with thee, as witnessed by the church over which thou presidest." The bishop, thinking that a sum of money was demanded, which he had never received, was astonished; but when he heard that it was the young man of whom John spake, he said, "He is dead!" "How?" said John, "and by what death?" "Alas!" said the bishop, "he is become a wicked man and a robber: the Church of God is forsaken, and he has got together a band like himself upon the mountain." The apostle rent his garment, and demanded that a horse should be saddled for him immediately. Riding off in haste to the place, he was seized by the outer guards of the robbers, and carried to meet their captain; but that young man, recognizing the old man, and filled with

* The names bishop and presbyter are applied to the same person in this legend, proving that the distinction between the two was introduced later into the Church.

shame, turned away and fled. The apostle followed with all his speed, crying aloud, "Flee not, my son, from me, thy aged father; be not afraid, my son; thou hast still a hope of life, and I will ask Christ for thee; I will give my life for thee. Stop, trust me; Christ hath sent me." The young man at first stopped with downcast looks, then threw away his weapons, came trembling to the apostle, and with lamentations tried to make excuses for his sin, but concealed his right hand. The apostle assured him that he had already obtained pardon for him from the Lord, and kissing the right hand, as if purifying it from its wicked acts, he led him back and restored him to the Church.

The beautiful nature of this story must not be allowed to render authentic that which has within it the marks of unauthenticated legend. Two hundred years had passed when Clement of Alexandria inserted in his work the narrative which Eusebius, after another hundred years, repeated in his Ecclesiastical History. There is no proof that any of the circumstances which surround it are true. We have no certainty that St John was exiled by Domitian to Patmos. There is no authority for our belief that he removed to Ephesus when released from Patmos, and those who have related his imprisonment and his release, besides other writers, admit that there was another Christian John residing at Ephesus. It is not recorded that any of the early Christians were banished: nothing short of death seems to have been their fate; and even the details of the manner in which the apostle is said to have reclaimed the young man from his wickedness, however picturesque and suited to the feelings of the simple Christian multitude, will not bear the touch of criticism. There is no other instance on record of a man who had become notorious for his crimes as captain of banditti being allowed to re-enter society in the easy manner which is here related. The bishop and clergy of Ephesus were doubtless held in awe by those who formed their flock, but the Ephesians generally must have suffered from the crimes of the banditti, and would hardly allow their captain so lightly to resume the garb and character of a citizen. Death by crucifixion was the fate which the Roman laws assigned to robbers. Nor do we learn that the band which the young man formed, and of which he became the captain, showed any signs of displeasure at being deserted by him. Such is not the feeling of banditti in either the Eastern or the Western countries of the world; on the contrary, the

laws of a brigand confederacy are remarkably stern and unforgiving towards traitors: we cannot believe that the young pupil of St John could have escaped the vengeance of those who had been led by him into a course of life that might bring them all to the scaffold, and had then by him, their captain, been abandoned.

We must, therefore, accept this narrative as a beautiful story, pleasant to those who heard it, and at the same time seeming to show that the Christian bishops, even in those early days, had the same power to override the civil magistrates which in later and not very remote times they claimed and possessed.

There are other stories concerning this apostle, which may be briefly mentioned. They are all found in writers even later than Eusebius, and turn on incidents of the most incredible and even childish character. It is related by Augustine (*Solil.*) that he drank hemlock and suffered no harm from the poison; that, foreseeing his death, he made a tomb for himself, lay down in it and died, and that when it was afterwards opened on account of the earth moving [supernaturally] over it, they found it empty. Eusebius knew nothing of these things, but he quotes Apollonius as stating that a dead man was raised to life by St John during his residence at Ephesus.

Our notice of the son of Zebedee would be incomplete without some reference to the statement that there were two Johns living at the same time in Ephesus. The first who speaks of them is Papias of Hierapolis, as quoted in a former page (89) of this volume. He is made to say, after naming "John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples," that, not caring for books, he examined "what Aristion and the elder John, our Lord's disciples, say." This same Papias is he who has recorded, on the authority of John, the other story (p. 90) about the vineyard and its branches, which would go far to throw contempt over any statement that might be made by such a writer.

Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus (p. 92), is the first who places the residence and death of John in Ephesus; but he adds to this statement what tends to destroy its historical character altogether: he says that John, "who leaned on the breast of the Lord, became a priest, bearing the plate (petalon)." Now it is not to be believed that one of the twelve disciples of our Lord could have borne the outward insignia of a priest, save within the walls of Jerusalem and with the concurrence of the Jewish priests themselves. The

account given by Hegesippus of the death of James the Just (p. 82), implies that the Christians and Jewish magistrates were already less at variance, and, indeed, were beginning to form a combined hierarchy, which explains much of the later history of this obscure period. It is not likely that John ever left the city of Jerusalem, or its neighbourhood; and the statement that there were two Johns at Ephesus is another instance of the fiction by which one character is divided into two, and the acts ascribed to him, being clearly improbable, are divided between the two, according as the opinion of writer or reader may suggest.

That St John, with others named by Polycrates, kept the "day of the fourteenth of the Passover," or, in other words, kept Easter on a day which differed from that kept in the Roman Church, must also be considered as a later fiction, introduced to explain and justify the grievous schism which divided the Church in after years.

Our notice of St John, personally, would here be complete if we limited ourselves to the Scriptural narrative alone; but we see that in books of wide circulation not only other narratives have been added from later and untrustworthy sources, but even the Scriptural accounts have been made to relate what cannot be substantiated by a strict interpretation of their meaning. We read in the work of reference quoted in a former page (233) of this work, as follows, concerning St John:

> The Gospels give us the name of his father Zebedæus (Matt. iv, 21) and his mother Salome (Matt. xxvii, 56, compared with Mark xv, 40; xvi, 1). Of the former we know nothing more. The traditions of the fourth century (Epiphan. iii, Hær. 78) make the latter the daughter of Joseph by his first wife, and consequently half-sister to our Lord. [Dict. Bib. i, 1104.]

To refute this imaginary pedigree, it is only necessary to refer to the passages from the Gospels on which it is based. The statement of St Matthew has been given in page 233. St Mark tells us (xv, 40) that among the women who stood afar off looking on at the crucifixion of Jesus, were "Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the mother of James the less, and of Joses, and Salome." In the next chapter (xvi, 1) the same evangelist tells us that "Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the mother of James, and Salome," brought spices to anoint the body of Jesus. From a comparison of these texts it appears that Salome is a different woman altogether from the mother of James and John; and that it is not the two sons of

Zebedee, but two other brothers, James and Joses, who are described in those passages. It is not, therefore, unfair to conclude that the imagination, if not a more unsatisfactory guide, has led ecclesiastical writers to misinterpret the facts of Scripture in the manner which this example is sufficient to refute.

The Gospel according to St John.

It is generally supposed that the fourth Gospel of our canon was written by John, the son of Zebedee, many years after the other three. Those who hold this belief have, for want of real or direct evidence, indulged in all kinds of conjecture on every point concerning the work itself, the author, the age, and the style in which it is written. It is not needful here to enter into all these minutiæ, but simply to state with brevity such salient facts as are acknowledged by all, and certain inferences which seem probable from these facts, and from there being no evidence that tells against them. The subject, too, has been handled by so many writers that there is much difficulty in finding anything further to be said that has not been said before. It remains, then, to summarize briefly whatever may contribute to furnish the reader with a general view of the whole question.

It must be borne in mind, however, that every other point concerning this book is secondary to the question whether John, the son of Zebedee, was its author. As regards the books themselves, there is no mention of four Gospels until the latter half of the second century; nor is there any proof or even assertion until then, that St John ever wrote anything at all. He is not named as the author of any book by Justin Martyr, who lived about the year A.D. 150 or 160; nor by Tatian, Athenagoras, and the others who followed Justin for the next twenty years. It is indeed only in the latter half of the second century that our present Gospels are recognized, and all the four appear at the same time, so that there is no contemporary authority for one more than for the others. If, therefore, the Gospel according to St John was written many years after the others, there would have been a canon of three Gospels only, until the fourth appeared. Now Irenæus, who lived quite at the end of the second century, is the first who makes mention of four Gospels; and the argument by which he limits the number to four, neither more nor less, certainly bears with it much more of novelty than of conviction.

The words of Irenæus happen in this case to be in the Greek, having been quoted by Anastasius Sinaita before the Latin translation of Irenæus's work on Heresies had superseded and caused to disappear the Greek original.

Whereas there are four climates of the world in which we live, and there are four principal winds, and the Church is spread over all the earth, and the Gospel is the pillar and prop of the Church and the breath of its life, it is right that it should have four pillars everywhere, breathing immortality and bringing back life to men. From this it is clear that the Word which created all things, He that sits upon the cherubim and holds together all things, having been made manifest to mankind, gave to us the Quaternion of the Gospel, bound together by one Spirit (Hær. iii, 8).

It is thought that John wrote his Gospel in the island of Patmos, not far removed from the end of the first century, and that the other three were written many years previously. If so, the divine appointment that the number of books should correspond with the four quarters of the world, and with the winds of heaven, must have remained in abeyance many years. But the whole argument is childish; we know nothing concerning the origin of the four Gospels; and it is time to revert more closely to our purpose; and, neglecting all questions of time, place, and divine authorization, to see whether there are good grounds for believing or doubting that St John wrote the Gospel which passes under his name.

I. In the first place, the writer of the work does not profess to be one of Christ's apostles. The heading prefixed to it is not "written by," but "according to John." And the word Gospel does not mean a book, but the Gospel dispensation: so that the whole title is equivalent to "The Gospel dispensation according to the teaching of John."

II. The writer disclaims all authority as emanating from himself; and, after speaking of the disciple whom Jesus loved, and of whom Jesus said, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is *that* to thee?" the writer proceeds thus:

This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his testimony is true. [John xxi, 24.]

It is evident that this is very far from leading to the belief that St John was the author of the book. The whole chapter, in which it occurs, is an addition of a later date, and it is not John, but the disciple whom Jesus loved, that

is here described; and the identity of the two, however possible, is wholly without proof or evidence. Even if this could with certainty be proved, the writer of the book quotes the testimony of John, who may have written on those very things which now appear in the work; but the writer clearly leads us to suppose that, although quoting from some apostle here, he has a distinct being of his own. In perfect accord with this is the concluding sentence of the Gospel:

> And there are also many other things which Jesus did, and which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.—Amen. [xxi, 25.]

To express such an opinion is pardonable in one who writes about the good deeds and sayings of Jesus Christ; but it would be very remarkable that one, who had followed our Lord throughout his career longer than the greater part of his disciples, should throw such a cloud over the subject —it might be thought intentionally, to conceal his very small knowledge of that subject.

III. The third argument which might be adduced, for the consideration of unbiased persons, is derived from the language in which the Gospel according to St John is written. It is difficult to believe that he who, when brought before the Jewish council, was discharged with slight, if not contempt, as an ignorant and unlearned man, could have written in Greek, a language which was generally repudiated, and never learnt, as Josephus tells us, by any of the Jews. When the disciples returned to Galilee, after the Resurrection, John is named among the seven who were resuming their occupation of fishing on the Sea of Galilee. When did he begin to study the Greek language? It is by no means one of the easiest of human studies, and yet John is named as the author of a book written in smooth and easy Greek; certainly not down to the level of a Galilean fisherman; and, with equal certainty, far above the level of the Revelation, and of all the epistles of Paul or Peter in point of style. But it is hardly necessary to compare those books on such points as these. It is only needful to ask where unlearned Galilean fishermen learned to write in Greek? a language which Josephus, the learned Jew, not only took years to learn, but declares that he was almost the only Jew who was acquainted with it. And Josephus lived at this very time, and was commander of a band of soldiers,

gathered out of the very same province of Galilee, in which St John and the rest of the apostles lived. The statements of Josephus* on this subject are worth the attention of those who do not duly weigh the fact of the apostles having written in a language which, to all appearance, was generally unknown throughout the Jewish nation.

IV. A fourth argument bearing upon the question of the authorship of this Gospel is drawn from the general nature of its contents. More than a quarter of it has no parallel in the other three Gospels; and more than half of it is made up of speeches, admonitions and discourses, far exceeding in number those which even a constant attendant on our Lord could have borne away by memory alone without notes taken at the time. In some cases these discourses run to a length which seems to show that the writer has forgotten himself, and added to his record particulars which could have proceeded solely from himself. It is possible, indeed, that the sayings of Jesus (*logia*), said by Papias to have been collected by St Matthew, have been inserted in this Gospel, of which five or six chapters, towards the end, contain nothing but these sayings.

V. There are also in this Gospel numerous omissions of most important things, which St John himself witnessed; and some of which he, with only one or two others, was especially invited to witness. These are—

1. The Transfiguration, mentioned by Matthew (xvii, 2) and Mark (ix, 2), neither of whom was present; but omitted by John, who, alone of the four evangelists, might have given us a relation of what he saw. The omission is the more remarkable, that an allusion to it is made in the Second Epistle (i, 18), ascribed to Peter, who also with James was present at that miraculous scene.

2. The raising of Jairus's daughter from the dead, which, of course, is one of the most wonderful miracles on record, is related somewhat fully by Matthew (ix, 18), by Mark (v, 22), and by Luke (viii, 41), neither of whom was present; but it is wholly omitted by John, who, as on other occasions, was admitted with James and Peter to be witnesses of a fact which one would think sufficient to have been circulated by fame throughout the world.

3. The scene which is presented to us as having hap-

---

* [They will be found in the last chapter of his "Antiquities of the Jews," and Book i, c. 9 of his treatise against Apion, and have been given at length in page 42 of my "Christian Records."]

pened after the last supper and which is called the "Agony in the Garden" of Gethsemane, is fully described by Matthew (xxvi, 37), by Mark (xiv, 37) and by Luke (xxii, 40), but is omitted by John, who here also is said in one of the narratives to have been one of three only who were allowed to be present.

4. To omit the fact that Jesus was actually baptized seems almost equally remarkable, seeing that the Gospel of St John brings him into contact with the Baptist even in its first chapter; and the interview leads only to a declaration that Jesus was the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world.

5. It is equally surprising that the ascension of Jesus to heaven, briefly told in the Gospels of Mark and Luke, who were not of the twelve, and therefore not present, is wholly omitted by Matthew and John, the only ones of the four who were of the twelve, and consequently must have been present at that last and most miraculous passage in the history of our Lord.

6. It is related in the first three Gospels, more or less fully, that Jesus, immediately after his interview with John the Baptist, passed forty days in the wilderness, fasting, and tempted by the devil (MATT. iv, 1; MARK, i, 12; LUKE, iv, 1). It is even added in the first Gospel that, when the temptation was ended, angels came and ministered to him. It is singular that such an incident should be recorded at all by even three of the evangelists, neither of whom was present, and who have given no authority for what they wrote; but more remarkable still that, whilst all the other three have mentioned these miraculous facts, John, who might have had more facility of enquiring from Jesus himself, should have written nothing about them.

7. The omission of Christ's genealogy, and of all his early history previous to his appearance when he, John the Baptist, "seeth Jesus coming to him," at Bethabara, three days before the marriage at Cana of Galilee, is less open to remark, seeing that the details given by the other evangelists are rather preliminary than incidental to the life of Jesus; and it might also be thought by many that Christianity would have been no loser if every one of the narratives, whether apocryphal or canonical, of which there are now so many, previous to the first appearance of Jesus as a teacher, had been omitted, both from all unauthorized books of legends, and even from the Gospels themselves as well.

The three synoptical Gospels describe carefully twenty-

eight miracles, performed by our Lord; but in the fourth Gospel only two of these are recorded. The same three Gospels tell us of thirty or more beautiful parables; but, in the fourth Gospel, no parable bearing the form, and entitled to be called a parable, is to be found.

Of all these miracles and parables, it must be borne in mind, John was a constant witness; yet he seems to have known nothing about them, including them among that mass of sayings and doings which, if set down in writing, would have filled the world. It would have been much more satisfactory to the world if more had been added by the fourth evangelist to the list of facts recorded by the other three, and our ignorance of the large mass of other sayings and doings of our Lord, now forgotten, been reduced in the same proportion.

From these omissions, and others which might be noticed in the Gospel now under consideration, we turn to another class of facts, namely, the insertion in the fourth Gospel of things which are wholly suppressed in the other three, but which would in the case of any other book of history be thought to require confirmation from the contemporaneous narratives. Such cases are the following:

1. We are told, in the Gospel according to St John (iv, 3), that "Jesus left Judæa and departed again into Galilee." From these words to verse 42 of the same chapter, is occupied by the conversation of Jesus with the woman of Samaria, in which the spirituality of Christianity and its extension to the whole world is well set forth. This incident is wholly unknown to the other three evangelists, and it is expressly said that the disciples were not present, but only came up after Jesus had declared to the woman that he was the Messiah (iv, 27-28). From what source, then, but tradition could the knowledge of this conversation with the woman of Samaria have been derived?

It might even be suggested that the passage in which this story of the woman is related, has been interpolated at a later date. For the last event recorded, before the mention of this incident, was, as just now quoted, that Jesus left Judæa and went into Galilee *(Apēlthen eis tēn Samarian)*. We then read of the interview at Sychar, a city of Samaria, through which it was necessary for him to pass. At the end of this recital, the same words again occur: "He departed thence and went into Galilee *(Apēlthen eis tēn Galilaian)*. Now the Revisionists have, in their edition of the New Testament, omitted the words, "and *went*," *kai apēlthen*,

leaving the sentence to run thus: "He departed thence into Galilee." It is perhaps on the authority of some MSS. that these words have been omitted, but if the intervening story were genuine, the repetition of the words would then be useful to carry on the history; and an interpolator also would have added them; and, at all events, the variation of reading becomes less suggestive in the case of a well-authenticated story than of one not confirmed by other evidence.

It is well known that a copyist, finding two following sentences ending with the same word, has gone, by mistake, to the second instead of the first, and so has omitted the whole of the intervening paragraph. In the same way a copyist, inserting new facts into a history, would naturally supply words to make the insertion harmonize with his subject.

2. The interview with Nathanael, at the very beginning of the Gospel, is related by John (i, 45), but is passed over in silence by all the other three, who do not even know the existence of Nathanael.

It is a favourite supposition of those who, at all risks, try to harmonize things which wholly differ, that Nathanael and Bartholomew are the same person. If this had only once been stated in any part of the New Testament, it might be accepted: as in the case of Joses Barabbas, Simon Barjona, Joseph Barsabas, and Jesus Barabbas. But Bartholomew and Bartimæus have no such Hebrew prænomens. The one is an apostle, named only in the four lists; the latter is a beggar, healed of his blindness by Jesus, as related by Mark (x, 46) and never again named.

3. The same may be said of Nicodemus, who came to Jesus by night, and is named three times in the Gospel according to St John (iii, 1; vii, 50; xix, 39), but is wholly unnoticed in all the other gospels.

4. There is, in the ninth chapter of the Gospel according to St John, a story of a blind man whom Jesus healed, followed by a long discourse between Jesus himself, the blind man, and the Pharisees. The narrative well describes the incredulity of the Jews, the persistent belief of the man who had been blind, and the admonitions of Jesus. There is hardly a more striking story in the whole Gospel history, but it is wholly omitted from all the synoptic Gospels.

It would be an easy task to add many more cases to the same purport as the foregoing, both of omissions and of insertions, not recognized by the other three Gospels. But

those which have been quoted are sufficient at present. A large field is open to enquiry in those chapters of St John's Gospel which contain so many sayings of our Lord, grouped together evidently from some preceding record or notes, and having been delivered apparently at many different times. There is, however, one passage, which bears upon the relations between St Paul at Antioch and the national Jews in Jerusalem, amongst whom afterwards John is to be reckoned.

We read in the twelfth chapter (xii, 37) that Jesus hid himself, and the reason is given:

> Though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not in him: that the saying of Esaias might be fulfilled, which he spake, "Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, "He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their hearts; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them."

It is no doubt remarkable that one who wrote a work to propagate the Christian Religion, the doctrine of which is that every one "who worketh righteousness is accepted with God" (Acts, x, 35), should have written what has just been quoted. But, notwithstanding the supposed influence of prophecy, a counter influence must have had some effect, if we may believe what the writer of this Gospel adds in continuation of what has just been quoted:

> Nevertheless among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess *him*, lest they should be put out of the synagogue [xii, 42].

It is not surprising that the Pharisees should resent the words of a teacher who had described them as hypocrites and deceivers; and it is certain that a large party of the rulers, Pharisees, and others, kept up their enmity to the Christians even after the death of Jesus, but the many who believed in him during his life would be still more numerous after his unjust trial and crucifixion. They were unable to save Stephen, but they afterwards gained such influence in the city that even the Pharisees were restrained from gratifying their malice, and some of them did not hesitate to join the society of the Christians.

The Epistles of St John.

The three Epistles ascribed to John, the son of Zebedee,

are of no more undoubted genuineness than that which bears the name of James. The first of the three is, indeed, described by Eusebius (iii, 25) as acknowledged to be genuine, but the second and the third, he tells us, may have been written by another John. The most important fact connected with this first is that it contains verse (v, 7) commonly called the "Three Heavenly Witnesses," which, although it has kept its place for many hundred years in the Christian canon, has never been free from suspicion, and has actually for more than three hundred years been arraigned by the best authorities as falsely occupying the place which it still holds in our Bibles. It has been displaced from the text by the late Revisionists, and added in the margin of their edition, not as allowing the possible genuineness of the passage, but as a memorial of the holdfast which it had maintained for so long a time, and to avoid giving offence to those numerous readers who would not willingly lose a single word of a book which they hold so sacred.

The reader who is not aware of the nature of the case will have no difficulty in understanding the following explanation. The whole passage, in the middle of which the interpolation is found, is this:

> This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth. For there are three that [bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one: and there are three that] bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one. [I John, v, 7.]

The words included in parentheses have been inserted at a very late period into the text, and although it is remarkable how they seem to agree with the rest of the passage, yet it is equally clear that the passage is consistent with itself, even if those words are left out. The Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, are the subject matter, coming both before and after the words which have been interpolated. This, however, would be only a secondary ground for rejecting those words. There are other conclusive proofs of their spuriousness.

1. They are evidently introduced in support of the doctrine of the Trinity. But the second person of the Trinity is here designated as the Word, and this term is unique throughout all the Epistles, and occurs, indeed, nowhere else

than in verses 1 and 14 of the first chapter of St John's Gospel. As, however, the introduction to that Gospel is thought to be a late insertion, and therefore not a genuine part of the work ascribed, whether rightly or not, to St John, it might be said that the Word, used for Son in both writings, would seem to show that both were genuine or otherwise. This would be a fair inference, were it not that there are other reasons, as we shall show, which prove that the passage from the Epistle is undoubtedly spurious, as has been said by many critics, in the case of the Gospel, that the preface to that also is not of undoubted authenticity. The argument derived from the occurrence of "the Word" instead of the Son, will become clearer when the second proof that the passage is not genuine has been brought forward.

2. In the next place, then, it is well known that there are still in being manuscript copies of the Greek Testament, some of which were written not later than the fourth or fifth century of our era, and others as late as the fifteenth century after Christ. In not one of these early Greek manuscripts, and in only three or four of the thousand later ones, is the verse containing the Three Heavenly Witnesses to be found, and the only authority for it is its occurrence in some Latin copies of a late date, into which it has crept by the fraud or carelessness of some mediæval monk. From this spurious Latin text a Greek version was made—the same which now appears in our Greek Testament—and even that is found in only four Greek manuscripts, written later than the year 1400, and, therefore, wholly unworthy to be quoted in opposition to the hundreds of early manuscripts in which it is not found.

The most eminent of modern theologians have concurred in repudiating the authenticity of this passage, and the opinion of the present Bishop of Durham, Dr. Lightfoot, seems to express all that is needful in support of this assertion.

Nor can we hold ourselves free from blame, if such statements are made and accepted, so long as we take no steps to eject from our Bibles an intrusive passage, against which external and internal evidence alike have pronounced a decisive verdict. In this instance our later English Bibles have retrograded from the more truthful position of the earlier. In Tyndale's, Coverdale's, and the Great Bibles, the spurious words are placed in brackets and printed in a different type, and thus attention is directed to their suspicious character. In Luther's German translation (in its original form), as also in the Zurich Latin Bible of 1543,

they were omitted. In the Geneva Testament first, as far as I am aware, and in the Bishop's Bible after it, the example was set, which the translators of our Authorized Version unhappily followed, of dispensing with these marks of doubtful genuineness, and printing the passage uniformly with the context.—*Revision of the New Testament*, page 26.

Recurring now to the question, in what manner and for what object the addition of these words was made to the text of the First Epistle of St John, it is admitted that it is not part of the original work, and it is suggested that it may have been written originally as a side-note illustrative of the collateral passage supposed to be genuine. If so, it would not be difficult to understand that a later copyist of the manuscript, whether in Greek or Latin, supposing it to have been accidentally omitted, might copy it into the text. But it may be asked why, in such a case, the Trinity, to support which the interpolation evidently was made, should be described as the "Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost." In no other text is this combination used, nor does the "Word" appear as representing the Son anywhere else than in the first chapter of St John's Gospel. If the passage was introduced knowingly, and for the sake of supporting the doctrine of the Trinity, a forger, wishing also to pass it off as written by St John, might be supposed naturally to imitate the expression which was elsewhere used by St John, and would be familiar to his readers. So far, therefore, from proving both passages from the Gospel and the Epistle to be genuine, it might not be unreasonable to infer that the interpolation in the Epistle, proved for other reasons to be spurious, was introduced in the place where it now is found, not by a careless but by a dishonest copyist, and the general result might be thought unfavourable to both writings.

But it may reasonably be said that an error of a very pardonable character has been committed in attaching the name of Epistle at all to this composition as well as to what is called the Epistle to the Hebrews. They do not appear to be epistles at all. They have no address or greeting such as the other epistles bear in their front, and are more like discourses, tracts, or perhaps sermons, written to inculcate certain doctrines and practices of the Christian religion, whether to be read in private or in public assemblies of the Christian brethren.

The Second and Third Epistles, ascribed to John, require but slight notice. They were discredited in the time of Eusebius, and had never before his time been fully re-

cognized by any writer of the second century. Irenæus (i, 16) speaks of them as the writings of John; but Origen, as quoted by Eusebius (vi, 25), says that John has left a short epistle, and he supposes that a Second and Third may be from him, but admits that all do not agree about this, and says that both together do not contain a hundred lines. This testimony tells against the authenticity of the Second Epistle, and is strongly supported by the fact that Mill, the well-known editor of the Greek Testament, first pointed out that of the thirteen verses of which the Epistle consists, the substance of eight of them is almost identical in words, and wholly so in sentiment, with eight verses of the First Epistle.

In the absence of positive information about these Epistles, we need not follow the track of those commentators who have done nothing but indulge in unsupported conjecture. The First Epistle has no preliminary salutation or name of writer, nor is it known to whom it was sent. The Second and the Third are addressed by the Elder, the former to the Elect Lady and her children, the latter to the "well-beloved Gaius whom I love in the truth." It seems useless to enquire who these persons were: we know nothing at all about them, and the subject-matter therein contained may all be found elsewhere in other epistles, which seems to lead to the inference that they may have been made up for some special purpose, and gradually became ascribed to St John as their author. The writer of an article in the Dictionary of the Bible says that the title Catholic "became attached to them because they were of too little importance to be classed by themselves, and, so far as doctrine went, were regarded as appendices to the First Epistle" (Art. John). This is not a very weighty estimate of the value or usefulness of them to the Church, and is a good reason for adding nothing more about them.

The Revelation.

The third work ascribed to the son of Zebedee is entitled in our copies, The Revelation of St John the Divine (*Theologos*); and its genuineness has been assailed with even greater doubt than that of either the Gospel or the Epistles ascribed to the same writer. In the first three verses, which may be considered a kind of preface, we have a clear statement that the Revelation was made by God through his servant John, which may, therefore, be considered as its author's name.

The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified *it* by his angel unto his servant John: who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that he saw. Blessed *is* he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand. [Rev. i, 1–3.]

In accordance with these words, it may be noticed that the writer constantly used the first personal pronoun I, and in the last chapter, verse 8, he says expressly:

And I John saw these things, and heard *them*. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things.

In the concluding verses a severe judgement is threatened against any one who shall take away from the words of this prophecy, and the reader is informed that he who testifieth these things saith, "Surely I come quickly."

Notwithstanding these strong words, it has been doubted from the very first whether John, the son of Zebedee, was the writer of this book. There remain, to this day, several other Revelations which have been handed down from dates more or less remote. Four of these have been published in the work of Professor Tischendorf, under the names of Moses, Esdras, Paul, and John. It is worthy of notice that the last of the four, John, has the same epithet, the "Divine" or Theologian, which is found in our canonical book of the Revelation; and this opens the door to a serious doubt whether such an epithet is applicable to any one of our Lord's apostles. Those who read carefully the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and even the Epistles, cannot but see a serious and overwhelming desire on the part of the writers to teach morality to the world, even a higher and more complete morality than that which was practised by those whom they termed Gentiles around them. To this they added the feeling of gratitude to our Lord for laying down his life in their stead, together with the duty of imitating him, and trusting to obtain the favour of his Father through his intercession. But the idea of establishing a school of theology, in which one of the twelve apostles should be designated by the title of Theologian, does not seem to be sanctioned by any authority that can be traced back to the early days of the Christian religion. Whilst, therefore, we have this very intelligible argument to guide

us in forming a judgement, it would seem needless to go into minute criticism of style to enable us to come to the same conclusion. There are, however, certain points which may not be lightly passed over.

The Revelation, like the other books of the New Testament, is built up of words and phrases copied from the Greek Septuagint, and it is not easy to show how the writer of it could have obtained the knowledge of those words and phrases unless he had made a careful study of the Septuagint during many more years than can well be assigned to John, the son of Zebedee. To suppose that he had gone through this course of study whilst still a fisherman on the Sea of Galilee, cannot for a moment be entertained by those who know what a task it is to study a foreign language so difficult as the Greek, whilst principally engaged in procuring for one's self and family by daily work the necessaries of life. A few instances will show how the writer of the Revelation has copied phrases from the Greek version of the Bible to which the name of Septuagint is given.

1. In i, 6, we have the words *basileis kai hiereis*, corresponding with *basilea kai hierea*, Lamentation (ii, 6); and in the same verse *eis tous aiōnas tōn aiōnōn* corresponds with *eis ton aiōna tou aiōnos* occurring in the Psalms (cxliv, 1, 2, 21).

2. In the 13th verse of the first chapter, the words "son of man," *huiō anthropou*, are the same as in Daniel (x, 16): *endedumenon podērē* is *endedukōs podērē*, and *zonēn chrusēn* is *zōnē sapheiron* in Ezekiel (ix, 2, 11). The first term "son of man" seems to express the idea as well as the words as derived from Daniel, for the visions which are related in the Revelation are similar in form, if not in matter, to those which had already found a description in the book of the old Hebrew prophet. The second passage from Ezekiel represents a description of dress which cannot fail to strike the reader as exceptional both in word and thought; and in the third we have a girdle ornamented with gold in the one case and a sapphire in the other.

3. In verse 15 we have *phōnē hudatōn pollōn*, "the sound of many waters," occurring in Ezekiel (xliii, 2)—not an obvious expression for an inundation, even if the thought were fully recognized. There are in the Revelation hundreds of such words, which have been copied from various books of the Septuagint, many of them not very obvious to an ordinary writer of the Greek language; others joined in phrases which could hardly have occurred to the writer's own

mind; and in the case of visions, such as the Revelation is full of, not only the words, but the thoughts and subject matter show great similarity to those of Ezekiel and Daniel, even if it be conceded that they were not actually drawn from those ancient prophets. There is also a great similarity of thought in one of the concluding paragraphs of the Revelation to a passage of Deuteronomy. The writer says:

If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, &c. [REV. xxii, 18, 19.]

Such a wish, that a book may descend unaltered to posterity, has more than once been expressed by its writer. This, however, does not forbid our thinking that the Revelationist has taken his idea from the Deuteronomist:

Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish *aught* from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you. [DEUT. iv, 2.]

Nor has this book been noticed by any writer of early Christian times, unless we believe the account which Eusebius gives, quoting from Papias, a Christian writer, who lived perhaps early in the second century. The fragment which Eusebius quotes from his book on Our Lord's Sayings has been copied in a former page (89). But Eusebius adds his own comment upon the words of Papias, thus:

It is proper to observe that the name of John is twice mentioned. The former of them he mentions with Peter, and James, and Matthew, and the other apostles, evidently meaning the evangelists. But in a separate part of his discourse he ranks the other John with the rest, not included in the number of the apostles, placing Aristion before him. [*E. H.* iii, 39.]

In the same chapter of his Ecclesiastical History Eusebius points out that Papias names the second John as an elder, and that the truth of what he says is proved by there being two monuments at Ephesus bearing the name of John; and Eusebius suggests that it was the second John, if one is not disposed to allow that it was the first, who saw the Revelation which passes under the name of John the Divine. "But it is worth while [says Eusebius] to add to the sayings of Papias, which have been related, other sentences of his,

in which he records some other marvelous things which came to him by tradition." He relates the resurrection of a dead man that took place where he was, and again another miracle that happened to Justus, surnamed Barsabas, how he drank a rank poison, and, by the grace of God, suffered no harm. . . . Also he, Papias, says that there will be a thousand years after the resurrection from the dead, when Christ will reign bodily upon the earth. It would be not illogical to infer from these words that John the Divine, or the other John, as Eusebius calls him, has as good a claim as the son of Zebedee to the authorship of the Book of Revelation.

But the Ecclesiastical Historian, from whom we draw nearly everything that we know about the post-canonical Acts of the Apostles, seems to take a pleasure in quoting earlier writers, who give contradictory evidence, and whose works no longer exist to enable us to form a judgement of the truth. In the seventh book of his history (25) he quotes one Nepos, a bishop in Egypt, who writes that some persons set aside the Revelation, as having a false title, and not being a work of John. He says that Cerinthus, of whom we read elsewhere as a heretic, wishing to have good authority for his own fictions, prefixed to it the name of John. It is fair towards this bishop, who lived not long before Eusebius, to state that whilst not admitting the apostle to be the author of the Revelation, he does not deny that its author's name was John, and he suggests that John Mark, who is named in the Acts, might have been its author; so that a third claimant for the title is brought forward as a rival, both to John the Apostle and the other John who was buried at Ephesus.

To these accounts shall be added one more extract from Eusebius, concerning one of the early heretics, Cerinthus, who may be looked upon as a sort of theological adversary of the apostle. The words of Eusebius, quoting from Dionysius of Alexandria, are these:

It is highly probable that Cerinthus, the same who established the heresy that bears his name, designedly affixed the name of John to his own forgery. For one of the doctrines that he taught was that Christ would have an earthly kingdom; and, as he was a voluptuary and altogether sensual, he conjectured that it would consist in those things that he craved in the gratification of appetite and lust; in eating, drinking, and marrying, or in such things whereby he supposed those sensual pleasures might be presented in more decent expressions—namely, festi-

vals, sacrifices, and the slaying of victims. Thus far Dionysius; but Irenæus, in his first book against heresies, adds certain false doctrines of the man, though kept more secret, and gives a history in his third book, as received by tradition from Polycarp. He says that John the Apostle once entered a bath to wash; but finding that Cerinthus was within, he leaped out of the place, and fled from the door, not enduring to enter under the same roof with him, and exhorted those with him to do the same, saying, "Let us flee, lest the bath fall in, as long as Cerinthus, that enemy of the truth, is in it." [*E. H.* iii, 39.]

Omitting further notice of these legends, we may refer briefly to an historical element in the Revelation which has been often cited.

Those who have defended the genuineness of the Revelation, setting aside the practical judgement which has been described as based on antecedent patent facts and probabilities, profess to find internal evidence from the seventeenth chapter of the work (9-12), where mention is made of seven kings, whom they consider to represent seven emperors of Rome.

The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth into perdition. And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast.

It may safely be granted that these verses are descriptive of the Roman city resting on its seven hills, and that the seven kings tally closely with the first seven Roman emperors—Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Galba, and (omitting Otho and Vitellius, who can hardly be said to have reigned at all) Vespasian the last. Of these it would appear five had fallen, and Galba "is," whilst Vespasian "is not yet come." He was, however, expected; and this brings us to the year A.D. 70, when that emperor began to reign. It is prophesied that he shall continue a short space, and we know that Vespasian reigned nine years. But the beast "that was and is not," and is one of the seven, and who will make the eighth, can be no other than Nero, who was generally expected to return and resume his sway over the Roman empire. Whilst this very reasonable interpretation of the obscure prophecy is put forward by several comment-

ators, others refer it to kings of the Edomites, with whom the Jews were often closely connected. Whichever view we take, the passage can only be quoted to show that probably this part of the book was written some time before the end of the first century; but there is nothing in it which in any way shows who was the writer of the book, and, indeed, nothing to prove that the book belongs to that early date at all, as it might have been carried on and repeated by others at a later period.

From the foregoing facts, therefore, and especially the presumption that John, the son of Zebedee, a lowly fisherman on the Sea of Galilee, can hardly be expected to have studied the Greek language, we may leave it to individual readers to judge for themselves, if, in the words of Eusebius, "they think fit" to include the Revelation among the writings of the Apostle St John.*

---

* The following extracts from Bleek's Lectures on the Apocalypse (Lond. 1875) may be interesting to the reader:—

It is very probable that the entire hypothesis of the banishment of the Apostle John arose out of this passage (i, 9) of the Apocalypse, and rests upon no tradition independent of it.

Tertullian says that the Apostle John, after he—and that at Rome—was dipped in boiling oil without being hurt, was banished in insulam.

If anything of a banishment had happened to the Apostle John and had been known to Hegesippus, he would certainly not have omitted to relate it. [BLEEK, page 154.]

CHAPTER XIX.

PHILIP THE APOSTLE.

THE name Philip occurs in all the four lists of the twelve apostles; but it is, moreover, the name of a deacon, who was also an evangelist; so that it is necessary to distinguish, if possible, between the two. The occasion on which Philip the Apostle was chosen to be one of Christ's disciples, as in the case of most, if not all, of them, is very briefly described.

> The day following [*i.e.* two days after his baptism] Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, "Follow me." Now Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter. [JOHN, i, 43-4.]

On another occasion Philip is introduced in a dialogue between him and Jesus, preparatory to the miracle of feeding the multitude in the wilderness. It is to Philip that Jesus addresses the words, "Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat?" (vi, 5.) And it is Philip who answers, "Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient, that every one of them may take a little." But with these words the name of Philip merges among the twelve. It is Andrew that points out the lad who has the five barley loaves and two small fishes; but all the twelve are employed to distribute these to the hungry multitude.

Philip next appears in company with the other disciples at the feast of the Passover.

> And there were certain Greeks among them that came up to worship at the feast: the same came therefore to Philip, which was of Bethsaida of Galilee, and desired him, saying, "Sir, we would see Jesus." Philip cometh and telleth Andrew: and again Andrew and Philip tell Jesus. [JOHN, xii, 20-22.]

Nothing, however, is recorded of an interview between these Greeks and Jesus—if, indeed, an interview ever took place. It is not likely that the Greeks had any idea of becoming converts to the religion which Jesus preached, and it is far more probable that they were led by curiosity to see a man of whom even the Pharisees said among themselves, "Behold, the world is gone after him." Neither does it

necessarily follow from the narrative before us that these Greeks were real converts even to the Jewish doctrine, that there is but one God, and that all other gods are false. For the forms and practice of religion among the Jews were at this time little better than those which prevailed among the Greeks and Romans; whilst the spirit of polytheism, which influenced both of these nations, would allow them to include the God of the Jews among the objects of legitimate worship, especially in that very land where his worship was not only predominant, but universal.

The name of Philip once more appears in the Gospel of St John, who indeed, alone of the Evangelists, has mentioned him at all, except in the lists of the Apostles, and the Gospel of John alone is without such a list.

Jesus says, "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also: and from henceforth ye know him, and have seen him." Philip saith unto him, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." Jesus saith unto him, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." [JOHN, xiv, 9.]

In the Acts of the Apostles the name of Philip, as already given, occurs in the list of the eleven apostles who met together in an upper room, immediately after the ascension of their Lord. But from that time we lose sight of him altogether in the pages of the New Testament, unless there has been a confusion between him and the Evangelist-Deacon of the same name, to whom the reader's attention has already been directed.

But whilst the more authentic records which form our canon are silent about the after life of this apostle, there are a few uncanonical notices of him which may here be mentioned. Papias includes his name among several others from whom had been handed down to himself some parts of the Christian history; and there is a fragment of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, quoted in a former page (92), from which it appears that Philip was a married man, and had three daughters. Together with two of these (who died unmarried), he was buried in Hierapolis, and the third daughter was buried in Ephesus, having attained great fame for the progress which she had made in the spiritual privileges of Christianity.

There are among the Apocryphal Gospels and Acts two short treatises bearing the title of *Acta Philippi*. The first of these gives us an account of the adventures which befel

Philip, his sister Mariamne, and the Apostle Bartholomew, whilst they preached the Gospel in Hierapolis, a town of Phrygia, otherwise called Ophioryme—the same Hierapolis, perhaps, which is mentioned in St Paul's Epistle to the Colossians (iv, 13). Here the object of worship was the Serpent, Ophis in Greek, from which the city received its name. The apostles were here seized and imprisoned, for trying to abolish the worship of the Serpent; but the narrative is full of the most absurd particulars, which are brought to an end by the apostles cursing the city, and causing it to sink into an abyss, with all its people. St John, however, appears as a sort of *Deus ex machina;* the people are brought to life again; whilst the Apostle Philip, dying under the treatment which he had received, is shut out forty days from Paradise, in punishment for his unchristian conduct in cursing the people, contrary to his Lord's warning, that he should do good for evil.

The second tract, *Acta Philippi in Hellade*, is in the same style; and that it is utterly unworthy of any serious notice, is clear from the following account of what happened to them in Athens. We are told that philosophers of that city, alarmed at the success of Philip in preaching the Gospel, sent to Ananias, the high priest of the Jews, asking his advice how to act in such a case. The Pharisees and teachers of the law, on being consulted, advise him, saying:

"Arise, arm thyself and five hundred powerful men from the people, and go off to Athens, and utterly crush Philip; and so thou shalt upset his teaching." And he having put on the high priest's dress, came into Greece in great pomp, with the five hundred men. Philip was in the house of one who was the chief man of the city, with the brethren who believed, when the high priest and the three hundred philosophers who were with him came to the porch of the house where Philip was. It was told to him that they were standing without, and he, rising up, went out to them. When the high priest saw him, he said to him, "O Philip, poisoner and magician! I know you; your master, that deceiver in Jerusalem, named you the 'Son of Thunder.' All Judæa was not enough for you, but you have come here to lead astray men who are philosophers." And Philip said, "I wish, O Ananias, that the veil of unbelief was taken away from your heart, that you might know my words, and learn from them whether you or I be the deceiver."

It is not very important to add to these statements and quotations what Eusebius has further handed down, or what Clement of Alexandria, and others of later date, have recorded

in their writings. But it is rather remarkable that Eusebius (iii, 31) quotes from Proclus a passage in which he says that Philip had four daughters, prophetesses, all of whom lived and were buried with their father in Hierapolis. There is evidently some confusion in these divergent narratives between Philip the Apostle and Philip the Deacon; and although we may admit the difference between the four daughters of Proclus, as supported by the account given in the Acts, and the three daughters as related by Eusebius and Polycrates, to be singularly unimportant, yet we are again met by a discrepancy as to the places where they were buried, which may perhaps, in the judgement of some readers, cast a reasonable doubt over the whole story. It would, on the contrary, be natural to conclude that none of the original apostles of Jesus Christ ever left their native country, or dwelt elsewhere than in Jerusalem or Galilee.

CHAPTER XX.

Bartholomew.

The name of Bartholomew is found in all the four lists of the apostles, joined to that of Philip. The word is of Hebrew formation, combining the prefix *Bar* (son of) with the name of the father, to which, as usual, a Greek or Latin ending has been added. The only name occurring in the Old Testament which can be identified with that of Bartholomew's father, is Talmai, which is found in Joshua, xv, 14, and II Chron. xiii, 37. In the Greek Septuagint, it is rendered Tholami in Joshua; and Tholmi or Tholomai in two of the most ancient manuscripts of the Book of Samuel. Bartholomew is named nowhere else in the New Testament, unless it may be inferred from certain passages in the Gospel of St John that he is the same as the Nathanael who is there twice mentioned, whereas the name of Bartholomew is not found there at all. It is, however, a mere conjecture that Nathanael and Bartholomew are the same man, and therefore, like many other useless and still bolder conjectures, may be passed over with a slight notice.

In the fourth gospel, as already stated, the call of the twelve apostles is related in a very different manner from that which is given in the other three. The name of Philip is there connected with Nathanael as follows:

> Philip findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." And Nathanael said unto him, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" Philip saith unto him, "Come and see." Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him, and saith of him, "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" [John, i, 45.]

The result of this conversation was that Nathanael became a disciple, but whether one of the twelve is not so clear. This, however, becomes slightly probable from the way in which he is again named in the last chapter of St John (xxi, 2), where we read of the interview between Jesus and his followers down in Galilee after the Resurrection:

> There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas called Didymus, and Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, and the *sons* of Zebedee, and two other of his disciples.

Here Nathanael might reasonably be thought to have been one of the twelve, although all were not then present, were it not that the last chapter of St John is said to have been a later addition, made when the memory of those events would naturally have become faint by time. It might also be supposed that Nathanael Bartholomew (Nathanael, son of Tholomi) is as appropriate as Joses Barsabas, Jesus Barabbas, or other combinations, which occur in the New Testament, of patronymics attached to the proper names of persons themselves, were it not equally true that Nathanael is nowhere found followed by Bartholomew (son of Tholomi), whereas in every other case the patronymic is always found, when first mentioned, preceded by the proper name of the individual, or else connected with no proper name at all. Bartholomew is nowhere else named in the New Testament; but tradition, as found in Apocryphal and other doubtful writings, has not suffered him to repose in the tranquil obscurity which has been his lot, as far as our canonical books are concerned. Eusebius quotes from Pantænus, but does not give his exact words. What Pantænus tells us (see p. 88) is from other writers. What Jerome tells us about Pantænus points to a written Hebrew and earlier book than the present Gospel according to St Matthew. The substance of what Eusebius says is this:

He [Pantænus] is said to have gone to the Indians, where it is reported that he found the Gospel according to Matthew, which had gone before him, among certain who there had the knowledge of Christ, to whom Bartholomew, one of the apostles, preached and left among them in Hebrew letters the writing of Matthew, which also was preserved to that very time. [Eus. v, 10.]

In the spurious Apostolical History of Abdias,* the acts of Bartholomew occupy the eighth book. He is there described as entering the temple of Astaroth, whose power of giving oracles to those who came to consult him was stopped as long as the servant of the true God remained within his precincts. According to the same legend, Bartholomew was beaten with clubs by the king Polymius, and finally beheaded. We are told in Asseman's *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (iii, 2, 20) that Bartholomew was flayed alive in Armenia, and crucified with his head downwards. It is superfluous to quote other legends which contradict and nullify one another.

* To be found in *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, 2 vols, 8vo. Nutt, London, 1852.

CHAPTER XXI.

Thomas.

This apostle is named with Matthew the publican in the first gospel; with Matthew, without the words "the publican," in the second and third; whilst in the Acts he has changed places, in the order of mention, with Bartholomew, who there is associated with Philip, whilst Bartholomew is named in conjunction with Matthew. We have no information how or when he was called to be an apostle.

It is a singular circumstance that, whilst Thomas is nowhere else named in the first three gospels, and no list of the twelve is given in the Gospel according to St John, there are two notices of this apostle, found only in the fourth gospel, which deserve to be remarked. The first of these occurs in John, where Jesus sets off apparently to heal Lazarus, but really to raise him from the dead.

> Then said Jesus unto them plainly, "Lazarus is dead. And I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe; nevertheless let us go unto him." Then said Thomas, which is called Didymus, unto his fellow disciples, "Let us also go, that we may die with him." [xi, 14-16.]

The brevity of our gospel histories is here much to be regretted; it is not easy to understand why Thomas should look forward to any danger from accompanying Jesus, who merely says that their going would be the means of their faith in him becoming greater. When at a later period it was reported that Jesus had actually raised Lazarus from the dead, there might be danger to his followers from the Jewish authorities, who certainly took great offence when they heard of it; for we read, and are surprised at reading it, that the effect on those who witnessed the miracle was not uniformly favourable. Although many who saw it believed in Jesus, others went and told the Pharisees what he had done. Upon this the chief priests and Pharisees met together to consider what they should do, and having heard the sinister advice of Caiaphas (called "the high priest that same year") that it was expedient for one man to die for the whole people, they determined to put Jesus to death.

The next appearance of Thomas was during the last

supper, when Jesus delivered that long series of discourses which occupy from the 13th to the 17th chapters of St John's Gospel, most of which have no counterpart in the other three gospels. Jesus had said, "Whither I go ye know, and the way ye know."

Thomas saith unto him, "Lord, we know not whither thou goest; and how can we know the way?" [JOHN, xiv, 5.]

To this question Jesus answers, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life;" but the disciples do not seem to have gained much information from it, and Philip takes up the conversation by a very pertinent request that Jesus should show them the Father; which request, Jesus reminds him, would have been needless if they had only realized the fact that when they saw him, they saw the Father.

But the whole of this conversation between the disciples and Jesus is not favourable to the opinion that they fully comprehended the nature of his mission, or that they were fully confirmed in their allegiance to his spiritual dominion. Even the final adherence of Thomas to the truth of the resurrection is unaccompanied by any declaration on the part of the others, and the immediate departure of seven of them into Galilee, where they resumed their trade of fishermen, is hardly reconcilable with what had just happened in Jerusalem without other knowledge, which we now have not.

In truth, the incredulity of the twelve disciples, and their indifference to the mighty deeds which they had witnessed, causes much astonishment at the change which is related of them in the Acts of the Apostles. The declaration of Philip to Nathanael, quoted in the last chapter, that they had found him of whom Moses prophesied, and that he was the son of Joseph, seems to lead to the conclusion that the disciples doubted even to the last of his exceptionally divine character.

From this time, then, we read no more of Thomas until after the resurrection of Jesus, when Thomas, acting as most men would act on a similar occasion, said that he would not believe that his Lord was alive again until he should have positive proof open to his senses that so wonderful an event had really happened. The proof which he required was soon forthcoming. Eight days after his profession of unbelief, he became convinced of the fact, and now acknowledged what perhaps before he had never conceived in his thoughts, that Jesus was his Lord and his God. The

whole of this narrative, as also the raising of Lazarus, is related in St John's Gospel (xx, 24–31), but is not alluded to in either of the other three. It might be suggested that the same unbelief which Thomas expressed about the resurrection of Jesus would have been equally natural in the case of Lazarus; we are not told whether Thomas believed that he was raised from the dead, and are left to explain the history in the best way we can. A very lasting result has followed from it, that the name of Thomas has been handed down to us as that of a sceptic, although the narrative rather tends to give us the idea that he possessed the ordinary faculty of an intelligent man, who would not believe so astonishing a miracle without due proof.

Thomas is named by Papias among those disciples from whom was handed down to him what he knew concerning the first age of Christianity. We read also in the twenty-first chapter, which has been added to St John's Gospel, that "Thomas surnamed Didymus," the Twin, was one of the seven disciples who were fishing on the Lake of Tiberias shortly after the crucifixion.

Eusebius mentions a gospel of Thomas, as he does of several other of the disciples, put forth by the heretics, and held of no authority by the true Church (*H.E.* iii. 26). That Thomas, divinely inspired, sent Thaddeus, one of the seventy, to Edessa, is also stated by Eusebius (i, 13), as well as that he received Parthia as the scene of his labours, when the earth was portioned out to the apostles (iii, 1).

Among the Apocryphal works published by Tischendorf, occur two gospels in Greek, differing the one from the other; also Acts of Thomas, and a tract called Consummatio Thomæ, none of which are of the slightest value, either for the life and actions of Thomas himself, or to increase our knowledge of the history of those times.

CHAPTER XXII.

St Matthew.

The name of Matthew occurs in all the four lists of the twelve apostles, as given in a previous page; but in the first gospel, said to have been written by this apostle, he is termed the publican, a surname which is not given to him in the other three. In all the gospel lists he is paired with Thomas, but in the Acts with Bartholomew. In accordance with his epithet of publican is the account of his first call to the apostolate, in Matthew's Gospel.

And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw a man named Matthew sitting at the receipt of custom: and he saith unto him "Follow me," and he arose and followed him. [Matt. ix, 9.]

This account is remarkable only in connection with another name, Levi, found in the Gospels according to Mark and Luke, where we meet with accounts similar and almost identical with that which has just been quoted; but the subject of these is no longer Matthew, but Levi, the son of Alpheus; and in both of these gospels we find that it was the house of this very Levi in which Jesus sat down to meat with publicans and sinners.

Mark, ii, 14, 15.

And as he passed by, he saw Levi the *son* of Alpheus sitting at the receipt of custom, and said unto him, "Follow me." And he arose and followed him.

And it came to pass, that, as Jesus sat at meat in his house, many publicans and sinners sat also together with Jesus and his disciples.

Luke v, 27-29.

And after these things he went forth, and saw a publican, named Levi, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he said unto him, "Follow me." And he left all, rose up, and followed him.

And Levi made him a great feast in his own house: and there was a great company of publicans and of others that sat down with them.

From this discrepancy it is not possible to escape without ascribing historical inaccuracy to one, if not to two, of the three gospels. All the four lists agree in describing

Matthew as one of the twelve apostles; but whilst he himself, if he wrote the gospel which passes under his name, tells us that he was a publican, two other evangelists tell us that Levi was the name of the publican, but they do not name him as one of the twelve apostles. Nor is this the only difficulty that meets us in this matter, for, in the Gospel according to St Mark, Levi is called the *son* of Alpheus, and although the word *son* is not expressed in Greek, it is correctly introduced into the English version, and this relation between Levi and Alpheus causes much embarrassment to those who seek to establish a correct table of birth and parentage for the numerous characters named in the Biblical history. Alpheus occurs in all the four lists as father of James, the second apostle of that name, known as James the Less, and the confusion becomes complete. If Levi was the son of Alpheus, and James another son of the same, Levi and James were brothers; and if Levi was another name of Matthew, it as clearly follows that Matthew and James were brothers. If these things are so, is it not remarkable that the writer of the first gospel should describe the call of an apostle named Matthew, and another of James, son of Alpheus, without mentioning that these were brothers, and without mentioning that the Matthew, whose call he relates, was himself the writer of the book, or that Levi was another name given to himself, the publican Matthew? Is it not equally remarkable that the writer of the second gospel should describe the call of an apostle named Levi, and should give a list of the twelve in which the name of Matthew occurs, but in which the name of Levi does not occur? To relieve us from this embarrassment, it may be observed that, since all the lists give Matthew, and not Levi, as the name of the twelfth apostle, we may reject the name of Levi altogether from their company, seeing that Matthew's gospel is uniform, and that the call, in his narrative, has been duly followed by admission to the apostolate. That both Mark and Luke name Levi may be considered as one of those numerous errors which are found in all histories, especially those which have circulated in manuscript for so many hundred years. To attempt to reconcile what is in its very language irreconcilable, is not only an useless task, but is apt to create a suspicion that a writing is without authority when such worthless expedients are used to make it appear wholly without blemish.

We know nothing more about St Matthew than what has

here been drawn from the gospels, which are the only authentic source; but we may escape from the doubt which exists concerning the names Levi and Matthew by following Clement of Alexandria (STROM. IV, ix, 73), who evidently regards Matthew and Levi as two different men. Speaking of those who have made different kinds of confessing Christ, he says, "of whom were Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi, and many others." By adopting this view, which coincides with what has just been said, we escape from any further difficulty on the subject.

That even the writers of the gospels were not exempt from error is manifest from several parts of their narratives. In St Matthew's Gospel, (xxvii, 9,) we find in the description of Judas's repentance, and his mode of dealing with the thirty pieces of silver, that a prophecy was fulfilled, said to be a prophecy of Jeremy the prophet; whereas there is nothing of the kind in Jeremiah, but it is in Zechariah (xi, 12, 13,) that what is called a prophecy occurs. Now if this were a real prophecy, and Judas acted as he did in order to fulfil that prophecy, we should be led to enquire into the practical morality which is involved in such a solution; but if we suppose that a mere reference is made by an historian to passages in the literature of his country in which similar thoughts, events, and expressions are found, we are free from the accusation against our morality, and the historian may still be read with trust in his general truthfulness.

A similar inaccuracy would appear to be made in the name of the people among whom Jesus and his disciples landed when they passed over the lake of Gennesaret to the other side. St Matthew (viii, 28) says, "into the country of the Gergesenes"; St Mark (v, 1) and St Luke (viii, 37) say, "of the Gadarenes"; and it is useless to try how such passages can be reconciled. It would be no wiser than to attempt to mark out the boundaries of two English counties before the coming of the Saxons or the Normans.

A third inaccuracy of quotation occurs in the words, "I will open my mouth in parables" (iii, 35), which are said to have been spoken by the Prophet—Esaias, the Sinaitic MS. adds. But they occur in the second verse of the 78th Psalm, and in the Greek Testament are copied verbatim from the Septuagint, *Anoixō en parabolais to stoma mou*—words which hardly would suggest themselves so exactly if translated from the Hebrew original. The explanation is that some Greek Christian put together our first gospel out

of what information he could procure, blended with the sayings which possibly Matthew may have collected in the Hebrew dialect.

Among other incidents named in St Matthew's Gospel which savour less of historical accuracy than of zeal rising to the figure of hyperbole, so often and lawfully used in poetry, is what has been called, in the language of the Church, the murder of the Innocents. In the second chapter of St Matthew's Gospel (ii, 18) we have a quotation from Jeremiah (xxxi, 15), describing the lamentation of Rachael in Ramah for the destruction of her children. This passage is quoted by the writer of the gospel as prophetic of the murder of all the children of a certain age in Bethlehem by King Herod, hoping thereby to kill the young child Jesus. But if this is a prophecy, it is, at all events, in every particular inapplicable to the murder of the Innocents, for the following reasons. Ramah was not in Judah, but in Mount Ephraim, although it is modestly hinted by the author of a popular Biblical Dictionary* that the "name of Rama is alleged to have been lately discovered attached to a spot close to the sepulchre [of Rachel] in Bethlehem." This, however, does not aid us much, for the tribe of Judah drew their origin from Leah, and not from Rachel, whose descendants would have nothing to do with the Innocents put to death by Herod. It is not, however, necessary to analyse the details of this story. It is not known to either of the other three gospels, and was perhaps in reality a much more limited instance of Herod's tyranny than is generally thought. It was, indeed, estimated by some zealous Church writer, whose name I cannot mention, that thirteen thousand may perhaps have been the full number of children who were sacrificed in order to maintain the dynasty of Herod. It seems hardly necessary to repeat the story of Peroras and Antipater related by Josephus (*Ant.* xvii, 3), and said by some writers to have been the prototype of the massacre of the children, as described in the Gospel of St Matthew. This explanation would destroy the history of the Innocents altogether, and much shock the feelings of many pious people.

From the writers who lived in the latter half of the second century we gain little information about St Matthew. Athenagoras may be thought to have quoted from our first gospel, where he speaks of rain descending alike upon the

* Vol. ii, p. 996.

just and the unjust, but he does not name Matthew, or his gospel, or any gospel at all; he may therefore equally be thought to quote the sayings of Jesus current for a long time in memory and by tradition.

Claudius Apollinaris, whose fragments are given in page 79, speaks very obscurely of Matthew, agreeing with certain authors of his time about Easter. This author lived about A.D. 150 or 160, and St Matthew's Gospel may then have been coming into notice.

Papias also says that he paid more attention to what came from the Apostles Matthew, John, and others, than to what was found in books—a remarkable testimony against any book, which at that time might claim the authorship of an apostle.

But a still stronger testimony against the claim of Matthew to the authorship of the first gospel, is the short fragment in which Papias refers to what he considered to be really a work of Matthew. His words are:

Matthew in the Hebrew dialect wrote the sayings (*logia*), and each person interpreted them as he was able.

The force of this passage is great. We read in the Epistle to the Romans (iii, 2) that unto the Jews were committed the Oracles (*logia*) of God. We cannot doubt that the word here describes the sayings and the teaching of Jesus Christ, not the four books or any one of them now designated by the name of Gospel. In a similar manner the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the first principles of the Oracles (*logia*) of God. And yet it has been asserted that the word *logia* is equivalent to gospel, notwithstanding that the word is used to denote something else long before any one of our four gospels was compiled. We know from Justin Martyr that there was a collection of Christ's sayings in his time; he quotes about two hundred of them, but says nothing about Matthew's having embodied them in a gospel.

The word *logia*, which I here render *sayings*, and which has been generally rendered *oracles*, certainly has that meaning in Herodotus and some other writers; but that is a secondary meaning—*words*, or *sayings*, delivered from the temples of Apollo or other heathen deities, and therefore *oracles*. The word is diminutive from *logos*, as many other similar diminutives—*epistolion* from *epistolé*, *thurion* from *thura*, &c. *Logos* in Greek means not only a word as composed of letters, but also an expression having a

sentimental meaning, or thought, and *logion* may therefore be reasonably interpreted by the English word saying—*logia*, sayings. Justin Martyr, indeed, uses the word *logoi* to designate our Lord's sayings, and may possibly, in one or two cases, have used the diminutive *logia*, which can hardly have a very different meaning, although it certainly cannot be used to designate a gospel, whether earlier or not than those which appear in our canon.

That some one or other did, about or soon after the time of Justin Martyr, embody these sayings with the acts of Jesus, so as to make a short continuous narrative of his mission, cannot be denied, and it is evident from its construction that it is of a fragmentary origin; for the various incidents, beginning with the words, "It came to pass in those days," or something similar, occur frequently in our present gospels, denoting a time later than that at which those events happened. The authority of Papias is of little value as a basis for any accurate criticism of our sacred books; and it may be satisfactory to know that Irenæus (iii, 1) is the first who names clearly and distinctly the four gospels which pass under the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John; and the loss of his original work, written in Greek, is ill supplied by a later Latin translation, or by the quotations from it which are found in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius.

Gospel of the Hebrews.

Another question, however, still more important as regards our New Testament, arises from a supposed work earlier than our present gospels, and named the Gospel of the Hebrews. It can scarcely be denied that, even before the crucifixion of our Saviour, the number of those who had adopted, or, at all events, heard favourably his teaching at Jerusalem, was very great. The triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem, and the account which we find in the Acts of the Apostles, however, perhaps, exaggerated in some particulars or left imperfect in others, must certainly be accepted as establishing this fact. Granting, further, that for a long time teaching by word of mouth would render it needless to write on the new doctrines which were taught by Jesus Christ, yet when those who had witnessed the miracles and parables of our Lord were removed from the world, and the memory of those miracles and of that doctrine was beginning to become faint, the need of some written record would occur forcibly to those whose duty it was to preach

Christianity; and from this cause a large number of books not only would naturally, but did actually appear. It has always been a subject of much interest to enquire what was the first book produced by the first Christians, or those who came next after them, and in what language and country such a book was produced. Some modern zealots have enquired whether and where the autographs of the books contained in our New Testament have been preserved. Such a question must imply great ignorance on the part of those who ask it. The original copies of the most interesting poems and other writings of Greece and Rome had long perished when the knowledge of them revived late down in the Christian era, and it is with much hesitation that two or three copies of the Greek Bible have been referred to the fourth or fifth century after Christ. We have no information at all about any original copies of the gospels and other writings of the New Testament, nor of any book on the subject as written before the time of Justin Martyr. There are, indeed, fragments of works which have perished, and amongst these are several sentences of a work written by Papias, who was Bishop of Hierapolis in the second century, and is said by Jerome (*De Viris illust.* xviii) to have been a hearer of John the Evangelist. This, however, even on the evidence of Papias himself, cannot be true, and of the date at which he lived we have no exact information. The Paschal Chronicle says that he was put to death in the same year as Polycarp (A.D. 163); and if this were so, it would remove him so far from the times of the apostles that his evidence could hardly be accepted at all on the earlier history of Christianity. But the statement, which we find in the fragments of his writings preserved by Eusebius and Epiphanius, cannot be passed unnoticed. When the want of written records was first felt, it is evident that enquiry would be made first at Jerusalem among those Jews who survived the downfall of their nation, and it is natural to suppose that the first notices of the Christian history would be written in the Hebrew language, seeing that all the first hearers, as well as teachers, of the religion belonged to the Jewish nation. Now none of those writers who have spoken of the age immediately following that of the apostles (before the third century) speak of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews;" and although this name denotes not a book, but the Gospel dispensation or system, yet, when this system was written down from tradition, or from scraps of writing that had been preserved, the book in which this was written

would naturally be denominated a Gospel, and when the first book of this kind became known to the world it would be described as the Gospel "according to the Hebrews," for all those who have mentioned the book so called evidently looked upon it as one of the first gospels that had ever been put in writing. Now it is a remarkable and well-known fact that until the time of Irenæus, who wrote at the end of the second century, no writer has named either of the four gospels, or those who are commonly supposed to have written them. Nor, indeed, has even Irenæus named the book which, perhaps, once existed under the name of the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It remains, then, to review those passages from early ecclesiastical writers in which the mention of this book has been made, although it must not necessarily be inferred that such a book was written or became known to the world in the very first years of Christianity; for nothing is said of it by Papias, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, or Irenæus, all of whom lived before the year A.D. 200, and neither of whom has named any such book at all.

The first writer who has expressly named a book entitled the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" is Clement of Alexandria, who died about the year A.D. 215, and who quotes from the "Traditions (*paradoseis*) of Matthias," thus:

> Marvel at the things which are present, laying down this first groundwork of further knowledge; as also is written in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, "He who marvels shall reign, and he who reigns shall rest." [STROM. ii, 9.]

The celebrated Origen, whose labours in restoring the text of the Greek Bible were so voluminous that they have perished all but a few fragments by reason of their bulk, lived about the same time as Clement. In his commentary on St John's Gospel occurs the following passage:

> We have examined these things greatly from a wish to know more clearly how, if all things were made through it [the Word], the Spirit also was made through the Word, being understood to be one out of many things inferior to that through which it was made, even although some readings seem to draw us to the contrary conclusion. But if any one admits the Gospel according to the Hebrews, where the Saviour himself says, "My mother the Holy Spirit lately took me by one of my hairs and bore me away to the great mountain Tabor," he will be at a loss how the Holy Spirit, that was produced through the

agency of the Word, can be the mother of Christ. But it is not hard to explain those [*words*] and this [*question*]. For if he who does the will of the Father who is in heaven, is his brother and sister and mother, and the name brother of Christ belongs first, not only to the race of men, but also to those which are more divine than that, it will be not at all more absurd that the Holy Spirit should be his mother than that any one should take the name of Christ's mother for doing the will of his Father who is in heaven. [*Comm. in Joan.* II, § 6.]

That the genuineness of the Gospel according to the Hebrews was not universally acknowledged when Origen wrote this, may safely be inferred from the words "If any one admits" that gospel.

If such a doubt were raised in the present day, we should probably give a hasty but decisive judgement against it from the words placed in the mouth of our Lord, so foolish that they could find no place in a serious history, and so irreverent that no sensible or pious Christian would endure that they should be inserted in any book of practical religion.

One or two short references to the work of which we are speaking may be found in the works of Origen, but that which has been quoted is sufficient to show that such a gospel was in his time received by some, whilst its genuineness was denied by others.

We proceed then to the time of Eusebius, from whose Ecclesiastical History two extracts will be sufficient for our present purpose: they both clearly show that the same doubt existed about the Gospel according to the Hebrews as appears in the work of Origen.

The first passage from the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius which bears upon our present subject occurs in Book iii, ch. 25, where a summary of the books of the New Testament is given, distributing them into three classes: (1) those which are acknowledged to be genuine, (2) those which are doubtful and disputed, and (3) those which are spurious. In chapter 27 of the same book he speaks of the Ebionites thus:

> These men think that all the epistles of the apostle ought to be denied, calling him an apostate from the law; and whilst they used only what is called the Gospel according to the Hebrews, they made little account of the others.

We have very little direct knowledge of the sect which passed under the name of Ebionites. Eusebius tells us

that they were a poor set of men, who entertained mean opinions of Jesus Christ, and thinking that he was a mere man, born according to the usual course of nature, they were bound to adhere to the law, and not to acknowledge the intercessory character and higher attributes of Christ, or the prevailing doctrines. It is not wonderful that with such views, they were unable to face the hierarchy which in the days of Eusebius was firmly established in the world.

The next passage in which the gospel is mentioned (iii, 39) informs us simply that Papias gives a narrative of the woman taken in adultery, and Eusebius adds that the same narrative is found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but this does not imply that Papias quotes from that gospel, or that he ever knew of its existence. One more quotation from Eusebius will supply all that can be gleaned from that historian about the book which we are considering:

> He [Hegesippus] writes many other things also, which we have already mentioned in part, assigning the proper dates to the events. He states some things both from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and from the Syriac, and especially from the Hebrew language, showing that he himself had adopted the [Christian] faith from the Hebrews. [*Ecc. Hist.* iv, 22.]

These quotations, then, from Clement of Alexandria, at the end of the second century, to Eusebius, at the beginning of the fourth, do not give us much information as to the nature, the contents, or the author of the gospel which would seem from its very name to have been current at an early date in the country where the miracles and other incidents of the Gospel history took place. There have, however, been critics who have attempted by a series of conjectures to show that St Matthew was the writer of this early work. Among these is the author of a recent work, bearing the title of "Gospel according to the Hebrews,"* in which all the fragments that remain as belonging to that work have been laboriously and usefully collected.

According to the author of that work, the first who quotes the Gospel according to the Hebrews is Irenæus; but to

* "The Gospel according to the Hebrews: its fragments translated and annotated, with a critical analysis of the external and internal evidence relating to it, by Edward Byron Nicholson, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Oxford, Principal Librarian and Superintendent of the London Institution. 8vo, London: Kegan Paul & Co., 1, Paternoster Square. 1879." In this work the author has laboriously collected all the fragments and notices which remain of the Gospel which forms the subject of his volume.

substantiate this assertion, the writer supposes that the Gospel according to Matthew is another name for the Gospel according to the Hebrews. This will be clear from the words of Irenæus, which are as follows, unluckily in the Latin translation only :

Those who are called Ebionites agree, indeed, that the world was made by God. But those things which relate to the Lord they do not estimate in the same way as Cerinthus and Carpocrates. But they use only that Gospel which is according to Matthew, and they reject the Apostle Paul, calling him an apostate from the law. [*Adv. Hær.* I, xxvi, 2.]

The second extract is identical in meaning and in words :

For the Ebionites, using only that Gospel which is according to Matthew, are convicted out of that same of holding wrong opinions about the Lord. [*Adv. Hær.* iii, 11, 7.]

Now it must not be forgotten that the work supposed to have been written in Greek by Irenæus is lost, and a Latin translation alone of the complete work remains; and although the fragments of it which appear in the works of Eusebius and Epiphanius, who wrote in the fourth century, agree loosely with the corresponding parts of the Latin text, yet it is by no means certain that the Latin text is earlier than the fifth century. This renders both the existing Latin text and the Greek portions of it less trustworthy than other complete and contemporary writings.

But even if the most thorough authenticity and genuineness be attributed to the work of Irenæus, the extracts above given make no mention of a Gospel according to the Hebrews, but only of a Gospel according to St Matthew, and no one has ever denied that in the time of Irenæus already was well known the Gospel which we now have according to St Matthew. It is probable, therefore, if we trust to Irenæus, that the Ebionites used the same Gospel of St Matthew which we now have, shorn possibly, as Epiphanius tells us, of the first two chapters, and especially of the genealogy with which our present copy begins.

If, then, we are right in asserting that no mention is made of any Gospel according to the Hebrews before the time of the Alexandrian Clement, it is also certain that no writer has named Matthew as author of any gospel at all such as we have at present, until the time of Irenæus, about the end of the second or beginning of the third century. It may be added, what indeed may have appeared from

other parts of our present volume, that there are said to have been other gospels besides that of the Hebrews, called from the people who used them, of the Egyptians, the Nazareans, the Encratites, and possibly of every other nationality or sect into which the Christian faith had found its way.

CHAPTER XXIII.

James, Son of Alpheus.

It would be difficult to find in any history, or in any part of the world, a society of twelve men in which identities of name have caused so much perplexity as the brotherhood of the twelve disciples, followers of Jesus Christ, has caused in the history of the Christian Church; and yet we see that the writers of our Scriptures have been careful to distinguish individuals by the addition of their parentage or of other peculiarities belonging to each. In doing this, they have not been very successful, or we should have had fewer of those, happily needless, discussions and treatises which have been written to clear up this obscure subject.

We are now to investigate the life and few notices which remain to us of James, son of Alpheus. In the four lists of the twelve apostles he is clearly distinguished from the son of Zebedee. But in two of the lists of the twelve (Luke and Acts) there occurs the name of Judas, brother of James; and if this were correct, Judas and James might be two brothers, sons of Alpheus. But this Judas is not named as an apostle by the other two evangelists, Matthew and Mark; Thaddeus occupies that place; and the absence of parentage, which so plainly expresses the brotherhood of James with John, and of Andrew with Simon Peter, tells strongly against the identification of James, the son of Alpheus, with the other James, whose brother Judas, as he is wrongly termed in our

version, seems to have been erroneously introduced, instead of Thaddeus, among the twelve apostles. There is also to be considered the strange confusion that has existed between Levi and Matthew, according to which the whole body of the apostles would appear to have been made up of much fewer families than would be likely in a movement which invited universal attention. The correction of the Revisers, who have replaced the word "brother" by "son" of James, would relieve us of the very embarrassing relation between Judas and James, both sons of Alpheus, with Levi and Matthew, also sons of the same Alpheus (or son, if they were one and the same man), by which a correct appreciation of the history is now so much impeded.

It is uncertain whether we are to understand that James, whom Paul saw and whom he terms the Lord's brother, was the same who from that time takes the lead of the apostolic body at Jerusalem. In the extract from Hegesippus, preserved to us by Eusebius, and given in a preceding page of this volume, he is decidedly called the brother of Jesus. And there is a passage in which Josephus has named the death of James, adding that he was the "brother of Jesus who is called Christ;" but this clause has been undoubtedly altered or inserted, perhaps by fraud, into the text of Josephus, to supply what was thought to be a defect of evidence in favour of Christianity, seeing that the national historian of the Jews did not even mention its existence.

Notwithstanding these apparently strong facts, it is not probable that the brother of Jesus took the lead at Jerusalem, and possessed such influence among the Jews: it is certainly not in harmony with the feelings of devout Christians in the present day that the official rank of a bishop should be bestowed upon a person so nearly related to the Almighty; those who would concede such a possibility should reflect that as much damage is done to a cause by too great exaltation as by placing on too low a level the claims, duties, or position of its leaders. We read in the Gospels that his own brethren did not believe in Jesus; and we have no information from any source how or when James, the brother of Jesus, to say nothing of the other three, was converted to the Christian faith. Nor need we attach accuracy to what St Paul says in relating his first visit to Jerusalem:

> After three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother. [GAL. i, 18, 19.]

He who writes this was, in all probability, personally unknown to the apostles, and his very words betoken that he knew not clearly who were the original apostles. He says that the only one of them whom he saw was James, the Lord's brother. But James, the brother of Jesus, was not an apostle; although St Paul, having had a hasty interview with him who appeared as the leader of the Christian community, and writing some time afterwards, may have supposed that he was the Lord's brother. It is much more probable that it was the son of Alpheus, who *was* an apostle, and not one who was not, that Paul saw and conversed with in Jerusalem. In another epistle of St Paul James is again mentioned as holding in some sense the position of a bishop, but not named as a brother of the Lord. This designation, indeed, appears nowhere else than in the passage cited from St Paul's First Epistle to the Galatians. In his Second Epistle to the same people he does not use that additional description, and it may reasonably be doubted whether words so few and easily inserted—not necessarily from fraud—have not really been so inserted.

For before that certain came from JAMES, he [*Peter*] did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. [GAL. ii, 12.]

As regards the other James of whom Judas is called the brother, there can be little doubt that our translators were led to insert the word "brother" in Luke (vi, 16), by seeing that in the Epistle of Jude he is styled the brother of James; and as the apostle (if there was one named Judas) was the son of James, and not the brother, either Judas the apostle and Jude the writer of the epistle were two distinct persons, one the brother and one the son of some one named James; or if Judas and Jude were the same, we have two James's, one the father and one the brother of Judas. We thus have two more persons bearing the name of James, besides the son of Zebedee and the son of Alpheus. Nor is the list even then complete; for we have James, one of the brothers of Jesus, and the James who takes the lead of the disciples after the death of Jesus, and is called by later writers the Bishop of Jerusalem.

I cannot, however, pass over the account which the writer of an article in a popular work has given of this James, of his father Alpheus, and of a supposed connection with the mother of Jesus, the Virgin Mary, by depriving

her of all her sons and daughters, who are mentioned most of them in the gospels, and placing them in a relation which those who consider the narratives in the New Testament to be based on a groundwork of truth, must deem to be simply imaginative.

Of James's father חלפא, rendered by St Matthew and St Mark *Alpheus*, and by St John *Clopas*, we know nothing, except that he married Mary, the sister of the Virgin Mary, and had by her four sons and three or more daughters. He appears to have died before the commencement of our Lord's ministry, and after his death it would seem that his wife and her sister, a widow like herself and in poor circumstances, lived together in one house, generally at Nazareth (Matt. xiii, 55), but sometimes also at Capernaum (John ii, 12), and Jerusalem (Acts i, 14). It is probable that these cousins, or, as they were usually called, brothers and sisters, of the Lord were older than himself; as on one occasion we find them, with his mother, indignantly declaring that he was beside himself, and going out to "lay hold on him" and compel him to moderate his zeal in preaching, at least sufficiently "to eat bread" (Mark iii, 20, 21, 31). This looks like the conduct of elders towards one younger than themselves. [*Dict. of Bible*, vol. i, p. 923, F.M.]

It is wonderful to what extent the imagination can fill out ancient writings, which in themselves furnish the most scanty outline of the subject to which they relate. The Christian world must not be led, whilst holding the truth of which our Lord was the exponent, to receive statements which rest only on conjecture, and, being built one on the other, can depend only on the credulity of those who receive them as of equal authority with the original records.

There is no proof that Alpheus or Clopas is the Greek form of the Hebrew. The names are not the same in Greek, any more than Cleopas and Clopas are the same. There was no sister of the Virgin Mary, called also Mary, nor is it likely that two sisters were each so named. The four sons and the daughter of Mary were not cousins, but the brothers and sisters of Jesus. Neither do we know whether Alpheus died before Christ's ministry began; nor have we any notice whatever of the places where the mother of Jesus and her sons dwelt. Jesus was teaching in his own country (possibly the village of Nazareth), in the synagogue, when the people raised the question about his brothers and sisters (Matt. xiii, 55). When Jesus, with his mother and brethren, went to Capernaum, St John (ii, 12) expressly says that "there they abode not many days;" and when they

appeared in Jerusalem, just after the Ascension, we cannot wonder that they "continued with one accord in prayer and supplication," as is related in the Acts of the Apostles (i, 14). Nor, lastly, does the conduct of his mother and her sons in trying to moderate his zeal in preaching indicate that he was the youngest of the family, in defiance of the express declaration of the Scriptures that he was the first-born of his mother.

Recurring then to our subject, we read nothing whatever of James, the son of Alpheus, in the Gospels, nor, indeed, in the Acts of the Apostles, unless he may be the same to whom Peter sent the news of his having escaped out of prison (Acts, xii, 17). We read only of a James who was prominent among the Christians for many years, although, as far as we know, he had never previously acquired any influence among them. Later on, however, in the history he stands foremost at Jerusalem, when Barnabas and Paul come up from the provinces to consult the apostles about the terms on which the Gentiles should be admitted to Christianity; and he acts in such a manner as for centuries afterwards marked the conduct of the Christian bishops. To justify this preference, nothing has been told us in our Scriptures; but it was not to be expected that Eusebius should fail to record anything, however slight or unfounded, which would fill up the blank: he tells us what follows:

> Clement, in the sixth book of his Hypotyposes, states it thus: for he says that "Peter and James and John, after the ascension of the Saviour, seeing also that they had been preferred by the Lord, did not contend for the honour, but chose James the Just, Bishop of Jerusalem." And the same author, in the seventh book of the same subject, says, further, this also about him: "The Lord, after his resurrection, gave the Gnosis to James the Just, and John and Peter." [Eus. ii, 9.]

In accordance with this supposed appointment, and by the advice of James, acting in his episcopal capacity (Acts, xv, 13), the discussion which took place at Jerusalem was brought for a time to a peaceful termination.

It was fourteen years after this that James is again named as present at a similar meeting, and another peaceful arrangement was made on the same subject as before, but was not of long duration. We have notices of this meeting, called in Church phraseology a council, both in the Acts and in one of St Paul's Epistles. The author of the Acts of the

Apostles briefly alludes, in the first person, to an interview with James :

> The day following Paul went in with us unto James; and all the elders were present. [xxi, 18.]

This second interview with James is mentioned by St Paul also, in his Epistle to the Galatians (ii, 9-12), as we shall have to consider more fully in our notice of that apostle. Nor ought we to omit that St Paul alludes to an appearance of Jesus, whether immediately after his resurrection or after his ascension, of which nothing is said in either of the four gospels. The words of Paul are these :

> After that, he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time. [I Cor. xv, 7.]

It is possible here to understand that it was the son of Zebedee of whom Jesus was seen; for it was some time, not perhaps, however, very long, after the crucifixion that this James was beheaded by Herod. But it could hardly have been the son of Zebedee, of whom Paul speaks in the extracts of a later date, in one of which he calls James the Lord's brother.

However this may be, our notices of James, with these brief extracts, are completed, as far at least as our only trustworthy authorities, the books of the New Testament, are concerned. The earliest other writings are not earlier still; but it may be worth the reader's while to read the account of James's death in the narrative of Hegesippus given in page 82 of this volume.

It remains only to review the Epistle which is circulated under the name of James, and to notice a work called Protevangelium, which has come down to us, ascribed to him as its author. The writer of the Epistle cannot have been the son of Zebedee slain by Herod, and is not likely to have been a brother of Jesus Christ. Unless, therefore, it was the son of Alpheus, the Epistle must have been written by another James, of whom no record has come down to us. The notices of James, indeed, are so vague and unsatisfactory that it is difficult to distinguish them, and there are altogether six occasions on which the name of James occurs, leading (by a wide extension, it is true) to the possible inference that there were no less than seven or eight who are called by this name in the New Testament.

Eusebius, in his Ecclesiastical History, declares against the

authenticity of this Epistle, and Origen omits it in his list. The words of Eusebius are these:

> So much concerning James, who is said to be the author of the First of the Epistles which are called Catholic. But one must know that it is deemed spurious: not many, indeed, of the ancients have made mention of it, as neither have they of that which is said to be by Jude, which also is one of the seven called Catholic. But yet we know that these also are read in very many churches. [*H.E.*, ii, 23.]

Notwithstanding the opinion of Eusebius, which of course militates strongly against the genuineness of this Epistle, many ecclesiastical partisans have endeavoured to support it as the real work of James; but the earliest Christian writers take no notice of it: the apostolical Fathers are seemingly ignorant both of the Epistle and of its writer. Nor do we derive much aid from Justin Martyr and Irenæus: the former knows nothing of any of the books which form the canon of the New Testament, and in Irenæus, although the Gospels were beginning to be known in his time, we fail to find any proof that the Epistle ascribed to James then existed.

There are moreover many internal arguments against the belief that this Epistle was written by any of the apostles. The Greek in which it is written is sufficiently easy in its style, and by no means coarse or vulgar—far beyond what one of the rustic followers of our Lord could have written. It is, indeed, far better in style than any of the Epistles ascribed to St Paul, and would be a wonderful achievement for a Jew, ignorant of every language but his own, as we are assured by Josephus were his countrymen in the bitter spirit which they showed towards all foreign nations. It is moreover fair to ask from what source these Jews quoted the Greek verses which appear here and there in their writings. In the first chapter of St James's Epistle (verse 17) we find a Greek hexameter verse, *Pasa dosis agathē kai pan dōrema teleion*, which must have been taken from some Greek poet, although I have not been able to trace it to its source. It may possibly be argued that what is here taken for a verse is only the result of an accidental concurrence of metres which sometimes gives to a line of prose the appearance of being a verse. We have an example of this in the first line of the Annals of Tacitus: Urbem Romam a principio reges habuere, "Kings from the first governed the city of Rome." Where do we find

any signs of poetic thought in that prosaic sentence? But the Greek words have poetic language, if not poetic thought, and have not the character of prose at all. Writers do not generally make use, in the same line, of the abstract and the concrete to express the same idea. Every good giving and every perfect gift is hardly necessary in prose, but may be appropriate in poetry. This objection to the authenticity of the Epistle involves no doubt of its moral or religious obligation as part of our canon; and although it is addressed in a very vague and declamatory style to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, which leaves us in much doubt when it was written, or to whom it really was addressed, it will not be difficult for Christians, as they are required to do in the case of the other Scriptures, to adapt its precepts to themselves.

Of the Protevangelium Jacobi a short account has been given elsewhere,* and it will not be needful to add much here. That it is the work of either James recorded in our Scriptures is held by no one, but it is equally probable that it is as ancient as any of our canonical Scriptures. The most important fact related in it is the death of Zacharias, father of John the Baptist; and a strong support of the truth of this legend is the allusion in the Gospel according to St Matthew to a certain Zacharias, son of Barachias, slain between the temple and the altar. This event must have happened just before or even during our Saviour's life, and as it is named also in St Luke's Gospel (xi, 51), —in both Gospels as the last murder which the rebellious Jews had committed, we need not scruple to accept the story contained in the Protevangelium as true.

Less weight is to be attached to the Liturgia Jacobi, and other apocryphal legends, which have not a shred of truth about them.

There is still, however, another source from which, until lately, it was thought the Scripture account of James, and, consequently, the whole history contained in the New Testament, derived the strongest and widest confirmation. It is well known that the works of the two eminent Jews, Philo and Josephus, who lived in the first century of our era, and wrote in Greek, are still extant; and also that some portions of the Talmud, which may have circulated at that time in tradition, have been handed down to our times in the numerous bulky volumes which contain the ceremonies

* Christian Records, p. 161.

and legends of the Jews. But neither of these names any one of the apostles or primitive disciples, save that Josephus has related the death of John the Baptist in a narrative (*Ant.* XVIII, v, 2) which does not agree with that given in the Acts of the Apostles. There is also a paragraph in which is a short notice of Jesus, but as it breaks the continuity of the history, is not noticed by any earlier writer than Eusebius, and plainly shows that the writer of it was a Christian, it has been rejected by all critics as a forgery introduced into the text of Josephus to supply what was thought to be a serious want of evidence in favour of the Christian history. The other asserted testimony of Josephus is equally exposed to criticism, and as it appears to speak of the death of James the Just, which Hegesippus relates, as may be seen in the extract from that writer, the account of it in Josephus may be here given :

Ananus, being such a man as I have described, thinking that he had met with a fitting opportunity, seeing that Festus was dead and Albinus still on his journey, appoints a sanhedrim of judges, and bringing before it the brother of Jesus [who was called Christ, named James] and some others, he accused them of having broken the law, and gave them over to be stoned. [*Ant.* XX, ix, 1.]

In this passage no objection can be taken to the name Jesus, which is no more than the Greek form of Joshua, and occurs (as we have seen) no less than fifteen times as the name of men in the history of these very times; nor would the name of James be out of place were it not that he is called the brother of Jesus "who was called Christ." The acknowledged spuriousness of the other notice of Christ in Josephus renders the slender mention of him in this place incomplete and suspicious. Josephus gives no information about the meaning of the name Christ, which is not an ordinary proper name, but the name of an office, and is a translation of the Hebrew Messiah. Josephus could not have named the Messiah without a longer notice of so venerated a name, and it has been justly argued that the words in brackets are an interpolation in the text of Josephus. That it is so will more plainly be seen from the issue of the story given by Josephus. It appears that Ananus had exceeded his powers by calling together the Jewish Sanhedrim.

Albinus listening to this argument writes in anger to Ananus, threatening to exact justice from him: and King Agrippa, on

this account, took away the high-priesthood from Ananus, after he had held it three months, and appointed Jesus, the son of Damnæus.

We have here a complete and consistent narrative; we have Albinus illegally putting to death a brother of Jesus, and King Agrippa not only depriving Ananus of his office, but conferring it on Jesus, perhaps partly in compensation to him and to his family for the loss of their brother. The insertion of the words *who is called Christ, named James*, may be due to the ignorance, or even the piety, of some Christian annotator, and not necessarily to the fraudulent motives which, perhaps, in other cases have clearly been detected in the early history of the Church.

CHAPTER XXIV.

Lebbeus—Thaddeus—Judas [the Brother] of James—Jude.

The tenth place in the lists of the twelve is claimed by three names, which it is extremely difficult to distinguish from one another. Some ancient manuscripts of St Matthew's Gospel supply the name of Lebbeus to fill this place, whilst some manuscripts of St Mark read Thaddeus. Other manuscripts of St Matthew sanction the reading of the Authorized Version, "Lebbeus, whose surname was Thaddeus," which, however, is omitted in the Revision, and only Thaddeus is given, as in the generally identical reading of St Mark. Whilst adopting this course, the Revisers cannot be ignorant of another explanation of the reading less creditable to the good faith of ancient copyists. It has been thought that Lebbeus alone was the name given to this disciple in St Matthew's Gospel, and that the words "whose surname

was Thaddeus" were afterwards introduced in order to harmonize the name with that of Thaddeus, which alone occurs in St Mark's Gospel. If this were so, it would hardly fail to raise great suspicion against the trustworthiness of those who have thought to consult the interest of truth by introducing into the original text words which might describe what was false. It is difficult to conceive any other motive, unless ignorance of the real truth may be assigned as an alternative. This, however, seems hardly admissible in the case of such important documents—at least, if written by contemporaries and eye-witnesses; whereas the attempt to conciliate documents which are at variance has always been thought among zealous Churchmen to be a laudable task. In the present case, however, the reconciliation has not been so scientific as in others. We may admit that for the Greeks and Latins, among whom and for whose use the books of the New Testament were evidently written, it was natural to substitute names more suited to the new relations of those that bore them. Thus the Hebrew Saul is changed to the Latin Paul; John becomes Mark, Cephas becomes Peter; and possibly many other names may have undergone similar transformations to render them better suited to enter into a system which has come down to us—wholly Grecian, with no remains or indication whatever of a Hebrew original. The names Lebbeus and Thaddeus differ from all these: we cannot distinguish the Hebrew origin of the one name in contrast with the Latin or Greek origin of the other, and it only remains to infer that the attempts to reconcile the two Gospels by such a summary process cannot be accepted as satisfactory. We may, however, leave the consideration of the original difficulty, seeing that neither Lebbeus nor Thaddeus occurs again in the whole of the New Testament, and that two authorities, St Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, reject both the names, which they supply by one Judas, having a certain relation toward one James, whom the Authorized Version makes his brother, whilst the Revised Version more fitly describes him as his son. That the Authorized Version wrongfully describes him as the brother, will be acknowledged by every scholar; and that they have been led to do so by the superscription over the short epistle in our canon ascribed to "Jude, the brother of James," will also be equally admitted. With this name, whether descriptive of a brother or of a son, there are connected many difficulties, which will be apparent from the following summary.

JUDE—JUDAS—JUDAH—JUDA.

In the Authorized Version of the New Testament, as has been well pointed out by Dr Lightfoot, now Bishop of Durham, we have Judah and Juda both occurring in the Epistle to the Hebrews (vii, 14; viii, 8), describing the patriarch son of Jacob who gave his name to the tribe; in the Greek, however, he is in both places called *Judas*. In Matthew (i, 2-3) the same patriarch is named Judas, and in Luke (iii, 33) Juda, whilst the same Greek form is seen in both places.

This inconsistency is found also in the name given to the Greek Judas by our Authorized Version, when it represents those who appear bearing that name in the time of Christ and his apostles. The brother of Jesus also is called Judas in Matthew (xiii, 55), and Juda in Mark (vi, 3); whilst the writer of the Epistle, although distinctly called Judas in the Greek text, is described as Jude, the brother of James, in the Authorized Version. It is with this last that we have now to deal, for it has always been allowed that if any Judas at all was one of the twelve apostles, it was the Jude to whom is ascribed the short epistle which is found in our canon. To attempt to trace the life of this apostle beyond his name is an useless labour, for we know nothing whatever about him, or of the James of whom he was the brother, unless he was the son of Alpheus, of whom notice is taken elsewhere. To identify Jude with either of those whose name appears as Judas elsewhere in the New Testament, is equally a work of the imagination. The name is given to several, wholly distinct from him of whom we are speaking. There was a Judas of Galilee, who made an insurrection in the time of the taxing, and who is mentioned by Gamaliel in the fifth chapter of the Acts (v, 37); and there is Judas Barsabas, who, with Barnabas and Silas, was sent down with Paul on a mission to the Gentile brethren in Antioch and elsewhere (Acts, xv, 22-32). That Barnabas and Barsabas should be here joined in the same mission, is only striking from the similarity of name; but it may be remarked that Barnabas also is a sirename given to Joses, in the same way as Judas is followed by the patronymic Barsabas. But the whole subject of these names is most obscure. It is the opinion of two critics, Wolf and Grotius, that Judas Barsabas may have been the brother of Joses Barsabas, who was put up as a competitor with Matthias for election to the twelfth apostleship. This opinion may be taken for whatever authority

the eminent names of Wolf and Grotius may give it; but it is not less lawful to suggest that the two names are descriptive of but one man, and that, as is often the case, there has been an error in giving him his true name, from the frequent concurrence of Judas and Joses in the scriptural narrative, which has led to many difficulties. It is more easy to accept the derivation which Schott gives of Barsabas, son of Sabas; but it is a further and less admissible stretch of the imagination to identify Sabas or Zabas with Zebedee, and so make Barsabas to have been brother of James and John. The same critic supposes this Judas to have written the Epistle of St Jude; and this might be thought to flow from the suggestion of Augusti that he may be the same who is elsewhere called Judas of James, without actual name to point out the relation between the two.

The result of this enquiry is short and simple: we might infer from the ascription of an Epistle to Judas that he was one of the twelve apostles; and the same inference might be drawn from the remark which we find in St John's Gospel (xv, 22) that it was "Judas, not Iscariot," who asked Jesus the very natural question, why he manifested himself to them and not unto the world.

With this scanty information concerning the tenth apostle, whether Lebbeus, Thaddeus, or Judas—distinct names, not to be identified by any Hebrew etymology—we must rest contented, for nothing has yet been put forward to release us from the difficulties of which imperfect knowledge when our histories were written, has most probably been the cause.

If, however, we know nothing either certain or important concerning this disciple, whatever his name may have been, we learn from Eusebius that he, at all events, did not look upon Thaddeus as the real claimant for the vacant place among the twelve, but as one of the seventy; and that he was sent by

> "Thomas, one of the twelve apostles, by a divine impulse, to Edessa, as a herald and evangelist of the doctrines of Christ." [*E.H.* i, 13.]

We have, in continuation of these words, an account of what Thaddeus did, translated by Eusebius from the archives of Edessa, where he professes to have found those spurious letters which passed between Abgarus and Jesus Christ. In the legendary narrative thus translated, it is observable that the words occur, "Judas, who is also called

Thomas, sent Thaddeus;" and this renders it still more difficult to separate and identify names and persons who are so inextricably mixed up one with another.

A few words only will be needful respecting the Epistle itself of which we are speaking. "Among the disputed books [says Eusebius, iii, 25], although they are well known and approved by many, is reputed that called the Epistle of James, and that of Jude."

To this unfavourable verdict of antiquity may be added a remark which in modern times may be thought to render the secondary origin of the Epistle still more probable. It may be thought also certain that the writer of the Epistle, quoting the apostles, as he does, in his 17th and 18th verses, did not consider himself as one of them. Nor can we think the story about the devil contending for the body of Moses to be worthy of place in a work written by one of the apostles. Nor is it satisfactory that in a writing of twenty-five verses only, nearly half of them give us words, thoughts, and admonitions which have evidently either been copied from the Second Epistle of St Peter,* or have themselves formed a basis for the more expanded forms found in that Epistle.

It is the opinion of Baur in his Paul (ii, 110) that the forging of such epistles must not be judged according to the modern standard of literary honesty, but according to the spirit of antiquity, which attached no such definite value as we do to literary property, and regarded the thing much more than the person. So merciful a judgement may be admitted in defence of those early writers, among whom such morality—and that, too, religious morality—existed, but can no longer be accepted in an age when writings compiled by one man and made to appear as written by another are generally termed forgeries.

---

* Compare verse 2 of Jude with ii, 1; 6 with ii, 4; 7 with ii, 6; 9 with ii, 11; and 10 with ii, 12, of the Second Epistle of Peter.

CHAPTER XXV.

Simon Zelotes, or Simon the Canaanite.

In the four lists of the twelve apostles occur the names of two, if not of three, Simons. One of these, who was by Jesus surnamed Cephas [Kephas], or Peter, its Greek equivalent, is clearly distinguished wherever his name is mentioned. But another occurs as the eleventh disciple of the twelve, associated with Judas Iscariot, if at least we arrange them in couples as they were sent out by our Lord to preach. But this second Simon, according to Matthew and Mark, is surnamed the Canaanite (Kananites in Greek and Cananæus in the Latin Vulgate); but in St Luke's Gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles he bears the name of Zelotes, or the Zealot. It is impossible to say for certain that the same Simon is meant by these two epithets; nor can we say with any certainty what the word *Kananites* may mean; whilst we have nothing to inform us why he was called a Zealot. It is, indeed, extremely probable that the writers of the four lists had the same Simon in their thoughts, although they might, for some reason unknown to us, have attached to each a different surname. It may, however, be noticed that the epithet Kananites is not a correct form of the word which would make this Simon to be of the race or country of Canaan; whilst it is possible that it may be formed from the Hebrew word *Knan*, the meaning of which is to be zealous; and thus the two epithets would describe not only the same person, but also the quality for which he may have been best known. The Zealots are spoken of as a sect more than usually obstinate in standing up for the Mosaic law. We have no further information about this disciple than what is here quoted from the four gospels, and, as Eusebius, at the end of the third century, has no information to give us concerning the later part of Simon's apostleship, and does not even mention his name, we may be safe to conclude our enquiry with the very slight notice which we find in the four lists of the apostles.

CHAPTER XXVI.

Judas Iscariot.

The name of this traitorous apostle has been handed down with execration from the earliest period of Christianity. Whatever discrepancies may be found in the other parts of the Gospel history, and even, where one would little expect it, in the four lists which have come down to us of the twelve apostles, there is no variation, at all events, in the name of Judas Iscariot. He occurs in all the three lists given in a previous page (173), in conjunction with Simon the Canaanite, according to Matthew and John, but with another Judas, the *brother* (as our translators have arbitrarily supplied the blank) of James, according to Luke; but the name is, of course, omitted in the list given in the Acts of the Apostles, seeing that Judas was dead before the meeting, which is there said to have taken place, of the eleven remaining disciples.

Of the meaning which the surname Iscariot may bear, various opinions have been formed, but no contemporary witness has spoken. It has been suggested that the name Iscariot is a Greek translation of the Hebrew *Aishkeriot*, "a man of Keriot," a town in Judah. But to this the objection has been made that if so, all the twelve disciples were not, as according to the received opinion, Galileans. But to this it might be urged, on the other hand, that his nationality as a Judæan, whilst it may have caused him to be preferred to hold the bag, might also have been partly the origin of a certain jealousy which the other disciples seem to have felt towards him. All derivations of the name are conjectural and of no importance.

Not only, however, is the meaning of his name uncertain, but his parentage is equally unknown, and even the slender notice of his father, given in the fourth Gospel, throws obscurity over the whole subject rather than elucidates it.

When Jesus, at the last supper, said that one of the twelve disciples whom he had chosen was a devil, the writer adds:

> He [Jesus] spake of Judas Iscariot, *the son* of Simon: for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve. [JOHN, vi, 71.]

It is true that in this passage the word *son* is supplied by the translators, who have not scrupled elsewhere to supply the word *brother;* but this latter term is contrary to all the analogy of the Greek language, and it does not relieve us of the startling recurrence of the name Simon, which, if understood wherever it occurs to mean the same person, would unite many of the disciples and our Lord himself in an undistinguishable brotherhood. We derive no advantage from knowing anything more of Judas Iscariot than that his name is identical with every execrable term of which the language of mankind is cognizant.

The occasions on which Judas Iscariot appears in the narratives of the four evangelists are not many, and they do not all record the same facts. We read in the Gospel of St Matthew that when a woman came with a box of ointment and poured it on the head of Jesus,

> When his disciples saw *it*, they had indignation, saying, "To what purpose *is* this waste? For this ointment might have been sold for much, and given to the poor." [MATT. xxvi, 8.]

The account of this incident is more full in St Mark's Gospel, although the words are very similar. He says:

> There were some that had indignation within themselves, and said, "Why was this waste of the ointment made? For it might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and have been given to the poor." [MARK, xiv, 4-5.]

In the Gospel according to St John (xii, 4) we are told that it was Mary, the sister of Lazarus, who anointed Jesus, not on his head, but on his feet; and that it was Judas who enquired why the ointment was not sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor; and the writer adds:

> This he said, not that he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and had the bag, and bare what was put therein. [JOHN, xii, 6.]

A still greater variation in the time and circumstances of this narrative is found in St Luke's Gospel (vii, 37), causing some interpreters to assert that the differences in these two narratives point to different incidents in the life of Jesus, which, certainly, is not probable. The divergencies are of

little value, and should teach us to read the Bible with the aid of that reason which is the best gift that Providence has bestowed upon mankind, rather than with that blind, child-like simplicity erroneously called faith, which better suited the ignorance of long-past centuries than the present age.

We now proceed to the next incident of the history, and we meet with a similar agreement about the treachery of Judas, together with deviations, not wholly on minor details, which can hardly be thought to alter the main drift of the narrative, whilst they show too plainly that various accounts had become spread abroad even in apostolic times. That this was necessarily the case will be acknowledged if we reflect on the difficulty of obtaining a correct description of what took place in the garden of Gethsemane, where Judas perpetrated the base deed of betraying his master. By what means and from what source did the writers of the four gospels obtain their report of what then took place? The disciples fled, including Matthew, to whom one of those gospels is ascribed. Not he nor any other of the eleven, as far as we know, but Peter and John followed the band of soldiers into the palace of the high priest, that they might see the end. John, indeed, if he be allowed to have written the gospel which passes under his name, has given us a description which it might appear difficult to dispute under such conditions, but he is silent about points which are explained in the other gospels. He says:

"Supper being ended, the devil having now put into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon's *son*, to betray him," [JOHN, xiii, 2,]

Jesus proceeded to wash the feet of his disciples, and said that one of them should betray him. But John has not previously written that Judas had made a compact with the chief priests to that effect. This had been done two days before the last supper, as related by Matthew, Mark, and Luke:

MATT. xxvi, 14-16.

Then one of the twelve, called Judas Iscariot, went unto the chief priests, and said unto them, "What will ye give me, and I will deliver him unto you?" And they covenanted with him for thirty pieces of silver. And from that time he sought opportunity to betray him.

MARK, xiv, 10, 11.

And Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went unto the chief priests, to betray him unto them. And when they heard *it*, they were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought how he might conveniently betray him.

The account given in St Luke's Gospel is in harmony generally with the preceding:

Now the feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover. And the chief priests and scribes sought how they might kill him; for they feared the people.* Then entered Satan into Judas surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve. And he went his way, and counseled with the chief priests and captains, how he might betray him unto them. And they were glad, and covenanted to give him money. [LUKE, xxii, 1-5.]

Judas having thus prepared the way for executing his treachery, we find in all the gospels most remarkable indications given by Jesus both of the person who was to betray him, and that the time was come. Whilst they were eating, Jesus says, "One of you shall betray me." "Is it I?" "Is it I?" say the disciples each for himself. To which Jesus replies, as we find it in St Matthew:

He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. [MATT. xxvi, 23.]

Even Judas asks the same question, "Lord, is it I?" to whom Jesus replies, "Thou hast said."

The answer which Jesus made is confirmed by St Mark (xiv, 20) in almost the same words; whilst, according to St Luke, it would appear that Jesus merely said:

Behold, the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the table. [LUKE, xxii, 21.]

According to these narratives, we have the well-known representation of the disciples each dipping, perhaps, a piece of bread or only his hand into the large dish containing food, probably rather solid than liquid, and placed in the middle of the table. But St John describes the scene differently. In answer to the question, "Who is it?" Jesus says:

"He it is to whom I shall give a sop when I have dipped *it*." And when he had dipped the sop, he gave *it* to Judas Iscariot, *the son* of Simon. And after the sop Satan entered into him. Then said Jesus unto him, "That thou doest, do quickly." Now no man at the table knew for what intent he spake this unto him. For some *of them* thought, because Judas had the

* These words confirm my theory, that the chief priests and scribes arrested Jesus by night, sentenced, and executed him early in the morning, that they might escape the notice of the multitude who supported him.

bag, that Jesus had said unto him, "Buy *those things* that we have need of against the feast;" or, that he should give something to the poor. He then having received the sop, went immediately out: and it was night. [JOHN, xiii, 26-30.]

If we were not assured in every part of the New Testament that all this was done in order that prophecies might be fulfilled, it would be more difficult to understand how these things could have so happened. It is not often that the meditation of treachery is accompanied by such effrontery on the part of the traitor, although it might be easy to appreciate the patience and meekness of his victim. But the supineness of those who were present at the last supper of our Lord is more marvelous, to those who fully weigh what was then said and done, than any incidents which the pen of man has ever set down in writing. And it confirms the view that has already been hinted at, that the twelve disciples have been used as a background by which the noble and divine figure of Jesus might be thrown more prominently forward.

One more observation in reference to Judas seems not unreasonable. We have in the Gospel History a narrative of twelve men leaving their humble trades in Galilee and following their teacher through both their native country and Judæa for so many months. When we read that one of the twelve carried a bag, from which money was taken to buy food and other things needful, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the money which this bag held was derived from sources similar to those which have supplied so many fraternities from that time to the present, and must still do so as long as such fraternities, charitable or otherwise, shall exist.

We now approach the fulfilment of Judas's treachery and the betrayal of his Lord. Jesus and the other disciples retired from supper to the garden of Gethsemane, where, in the intervals of his agony, he addressed his last admonitions to his followers.

While he yet spake, lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priests and elders of the people. Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign, saying, "Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast." And forthwith he came to Jesus, and said, "Hail, master!" and kissed him. And Jesus said unto him, "Friend, wherefore art thou come?" Then came they, and laid hands on Jesus, and took him. [MATT. xxvi, 47-50.]

The Gospel of St Mark (xiv, 43) describes the scene in almost the same words. St Luke makes Jesus say, not "Friend, wherefore art thou come?" but

> Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss? [LUKE, xxii, 48.]

For it does not appear in this account that Judas actually kissed him, but that he "drew near unto Jesus to kiss him." But in the fourth Gospel a very different scene is described. Judas does not kiss Jesus, but merely leads the soldiers to the garden, beyond the brook Kedron, where he no doubt knew that Jesus would be found after the supper, seeing that he had ofttimes resorted thither with his disciples (JOHN, xviii, 2). According to this account, Jesus himself invites his own arrest, and, having first shown his power by causing his adversaries to fall to the ground, he delivers himself into their hands. Judas also, no doubt, follows the band of soldiers with whom he came; there was no reason why he should take to flight with the other disciples.

One only scene now remains to be related in the description which the Gospels give us of this wretched man. When Jesus was delivered into the hands of Pontius Pilate,

> Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders, saying, "I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." And they said, "What *is* [*that* to us? See thou *to that*." And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself. And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, "It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood." And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in. Wherefore that field was called "The field of blood," unto this day. [MATT. xxvii, 3-8.]

It is only in the first of the four Gospels that the repentance and suicide of Judas Iscariot are related. In the Acts of the Apostles the subject forms part of St Peter's speech to the disciples, when "the number of names together were about one hundred and twenty." Of this speech part is doctrinal and part historical, but neither part has met with unqualified approbation from a large class of Christians. St Peter begins his address in these words:

> Men *and* brethren, this scripture must needs have been

fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus. For he was numbered with us, and obtained part of our ministry. Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out. And it was known to all the dwellers at Jerusalem; insomuch as that field is called in their proper tongue, "Aceldama," that is to say, "The field of blood." For it is written in the book of Psalms, "Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein; and his bishopric let another take." [Acts, i, 16-20.]

The proposal of Peter to complete the number of the twelve disciples doubtless derived weight from the sanction of the Psalm of David, adduced, it must be acknowledged, not wholly so as to commend itself to the judgement of those who still hold the name of Judas as synonymous with wickedness of the deepest dye. If, indeed, it was prophesied, not as the result of the depravity which is inherent in man's nature, but as the deliberate design of the Almighty, that Judas should betray Jesus, it would seem desirable to review the code of morality which condemns a man for carrying out the manifold and long-foretold dispensations of Providence. But the words of St Peter might seem to be borne out by the authority of Jesus Christ himself, if, indeed, our Lord's words have been correctly handed down to us in the Gospel of St John (xiii, 18), where he not only foretells his own death, but indicates the traitor, and adds, "I know whom I have chosen, but that the Scripture may be fulfilled." It is the opinion of many still in the present day that the choosing of one necessarily implies the reprobation of others, and so these abstruse questions are carried to a length far beyond the requirements of religion, of morality, and of common sense.

It is not impossible, however, that the venerable records which have been handed down to us from early times have been tinctured somewhat with the Oriental doctrine of fatalism beyond the meaning or intention of their first authors; but it is fortunate that, however this question may be decided, we still teach morality and religion as if having the free will which alone can stamp merit with praise, or wickedness with that reprobation which follows the name of Judas Iscariot wherever it is pronounced.

It is not so easy to get over the obstacle which meets us in the historical part of our narrative. It is puerile to argue that St Peter's statement of the purchase of the

potter's field is in agreement with that of St Matthew. The one says that the chief priests bought the field, the other that Judas himself purchased it, with the thirty pieces of silver. The former statement is in harmony with the despair of the traitor, his rejection of the money, and his hasty suicide. The latter implies that he was satisfied with his conduct, invested the money in a suitable purchase of land, and afterwards met his death in some manner the particulars of which are not satisfactorily recorded. The existence of a potter's field, called the Field of Blood at the time when these books were written, would naturally outlive some of the events from which it derived its name. Later writers would strive to learn as much as they were able, and, so powerful is the aid of poetry and of the imagination, would sometimes supply details which give trouble to future writers who seek to fix on a firm basis of truth what first presents itself in the guise of a mythical or even fictitious narrative.

Whilst the scriptural accounts contain only these few particulars, it is obvious that the inventive spirit of the second century would raise many enquiries, and, whilst endeavouring to obtain further information, would not allow so fertile a subject to pass without legendary additions to what is in the main a truthful history. Even serious authors might fairly suggest a question, how far the act of Judas might be beneficial to the world at large. We find in Irenæus (i, 31) the following passage:

> They say that the traitor Judas diligently recognized this, and that he alone (of the apostles), recognizing truth more than the others, fulfilled the mystery of his treachery; by him they say all things earthly and heavenly were dissolved. And they bring foward a fiction of this sort, calling it the Gospel of Judas.

These words, indeed, occur in the Latin text only of Irenæus's work, Against Heresies. He lived quite at the end of the second century, and seems to have been a missionary from the Christian community at Asia, dignified with the title of Bishop of Lyons.

Tertullian also, about the same date, has recorded some sentiments bearing on the same subject:

> There arose also another heresy, known by the name of the Cainites. For they also magnify Cain as if conceived from some powerful virtue which wrought in him: for that Abel was conceived and procreated from an inferior virtue, and, therefore, was found to be inferior. Those who assert this, defend also the

traitor Judas, saying that he was a wonderful and great man, on account of the benefits which he boasts to have conferred on mankind. For some of them [the Cainites] think that thanks ought to be rendered to him for this cause. For they say, Judas, perceiving that Christ wished to subvert the truth, delivered him up, that the truth might not be subverted. Others, on the contrary, argue in this way, saying, because the powers of this world would not put up with Christ, lest salvation should be procured for mankind through his death, he, looking to the salvation of mankind, delivered up Christ, that the salvation which was hindered by those virtues which stood in the way of Christ's suffering, might not be hindered altogether, and, therefore, by Christ's suffering, the salvation of mankind might not be hindered. [TERTULL. *de Præscriptionibus*, 47.]

The forgers of apocryphal gospels were not likely to abstain from handling a subject which engaged even serious writers. There remains a Gospel of the Infancy, written in Arabic, which seems to have been compiled from Greek originals, perhaps as early as Tertullian or Irenæus. The following legend will suffice to show the absurdity of these apocryphal writings:

Another woman, whose son was vexed by Satan, lived in the same place. His name was Judas, and as often as Satan seized him, he used to bite all who came near him, and if he found no one near him, he used to bite his own hands and his other limbs. The mother of this wretched man, hearing the fame of the lady Mary and her son Jesus, rose up and brought her son Judas with her to the lady Mary. Meanwhile, James and Joses had carried away the child, the Lord Jesus, that they might play with the other children, and leaving the house, had sat down together, and the Lord Jesus with them. The demoniac Judas came up and sat down at the right hand of Jesus; upon which, being assailed, as he was wont, by Satan, he wished to bite the Lord Jesus, but was unable, but he struck the right side of Jesus, whereupon the latter began to weep. Immediately Satan came forth from that boy, fleeing away in the likeness of a mad dog. But this boy, who struck Jesus, and from whom Satan came out in the form of a dog, was Judas Iscariot, who betrayed him to the Jews, and that same side of his on which Judas had struck him was the one which the Jews pierced with the spear. [*Evangelia Apos.* p. 191.]

Even as late as the tenth century, writers of theological reputation thought it not beneath them to repeat, amplify, and explain the conduct of Judas Iscariot. To that or to a later century belongs Œcumenius, who has left us a short explanation of the mode in which Judas met his death.

The passage appears to be a quotation from the lost works of Papias, and is given in page 90 of this volume. It furnishes no ground for disputing the opinion of Eusebius that Papias was a little-minded man, but is undoubtedly quite in harmony with other futile attempts to reconcile the conflicting modes by which the traitor met his death.

MATTHIAS.

The treachery and death of Judas made a gap in the number of the twelve disciples, which it was thought necessary to fill up. We are not informed how long after the crucifixion this was decided. It is simply stated that "in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples," and proposed that their original number of twelve should be completed. The election is thus related:

> They appointed two, Joseph called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus, and Matthias. And they prayed, and said, "Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all *men*, show us whether of these two thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell, that he might go to his own place." And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias; and he was numbered with the eleven apostles. [Acts, i, 23-26.]

In this manner Matthias became invested with the apostleship, having up to this time, according to tradition (Eusеb. i, 12), been one of the seventy disciples; but as he is nowhere else named in the New Testament, it may be presumed that his services were not so prominent as to require that they should be recorded in the early history of Christianity. Nor, indeed, does the narrative tend to set aside the view, which many persons in the present day entertain, that the number twelve as well as the number seventy, which, according to St Luke, was applied to the larger circle of Christ's followers, have been set forth as technical numbers customary from time immemorial among the Jews, rather than as indicating an exact distribution of ministers to discharge duties correspondingly distributed.

We need not be surprised to see that the authors of spurious writings, led on by the demand of zealous Christians, have not failed to attach to Matthias his due share of miracles, and also of persecution in preaching the new doctrine of the Gospel. There is a short tract called the

"Acts of Andrew and Matthias," which is introduced to the reader's notice thus:

At that time, all the apostles being gathered together, divided the countries by lot among themselves, how each should go to the lot which fell to him. It was therefore allotted that Matthias should go to the land of the Anthropophagi [*cannibals*]. Now the men of that city neither eat bread nor drink wine, but ate the flesh of men and drank their blood. Whoever, therefore, went forth among them, they seized him, dug out his eyes, and cast them away. They then made him drink a potion prepared from poison and magic, by which his heart was changed and his mind destroyed. [*Acta Apoc.* p. 132.]

The sequel of the story is that Matthias would have been eaten at the end of three days had not the Lord Jesus appeared to Andrew in the country which had been allotted to him, and told that apostle to go and rescue Matthias from death. But Andrew expostulated, saying that it was impossible for him to reach the land of the cannibals in three days. This, however, was overruled, and the legend informs us that Andrew enbarked on board a vessel of which Jesus himself was the prowsman, and a variety of absurd incidents occurred, which may be allowed to sleep with the apocryphal manuscripts, whence they draw their origin.

CHAPTER XXVII.

The Four Evangelists—Mark—Luke.

Of the four evangelists,—by which term is here meant not, as in the case of Philip, the evangelic preacher, but the writer of a gospel,—the first and fourth have been already noticed in previous chapters; and it remains to enquire into the history of the two intermediate writers of gospels, Mark and Luke, neither of whom, as far as we know, was ever in company or had personal knowledge of Jesus Christ.

1. MARK.

The career of Mark, who is the reputed author of the second gospel, is lost in obscurity. It is, by some, supposed that he is the same who is named in the Acts of the Apostles, where it is said that Peter, escaping out of prison,

> Came to the house of Mary, the mother of John, whose surname was Mark, where many were gathered together praying. [Acts, xii, 12.]

It is related also in the same chapter that Barnabas and Saul, who had been sent from Antioch by the disciples to carry relief to their poor brethren of Jerusalem,

> Returned from Jerusalem when they had fulfilled their mission, and took with them John, whose surname was Mark. [Acts, xii, 25.]

This event closes the twelfth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and in the thirteenth chapter a new series of events begins, in such a manner that it is difficult to look upon it as part of the same original narrative.

Not long after the return of Barnabas and of Saul (who from this time appears under the name of Paul), the city of Antioch becomes of greater importance than even Jerusalem in the Christian History. We have seen in our summary of the Acts (p. 25) that there were in that city certain prophets and teachers, by whose authority Paul

and Barnabas, accompanied by John Mark, went on a mission to preach the Gospel in Cyprus. On leaving this island, they came to Perga in Pamphylia, and here John, meaning of course the same who was surnamed Mark, departed from them and returned to Jerusalem. The cause of his departure is not immediately related. The apostles continued their mission, and lastly returned to Antioch, where they abode a long time with the disciples (xiv, 28). From the want of dates or other mode of determining the chronology, we are at a loss to follow in order most of the events recorded in the Book of Acts. We hear no more of John Mark until Paul, having, with Barnabas, spent some time at Antioch, including a visit to the brethren at Jerusalem, proposed to his former companion that they should again set out on a second tour, and see how those to whom they had formerly preached were getting on. We here have a reference to the conduct of Mark, for which no explanation had been given. On receiving the invitation to accompany Paul,

> Barnabas determined to take with them John, whose surname was Mark. But Paul thought not good to take with them him who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder one from the other; and so Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto Cyprus. [xv, 37-39.]

There may have been no other motive for Barnabas taking Mark as a companion in his travels, if, as we read in Paul's Epistle to the Colossians (iv, 10), already quoted, the latter was sister's son to Barnabas; but this explanation involves the question whether John, who is in the Acts surnamed Mark, was the same who in St Paul's epistles is known only by the name of Mark. In the passages where he is described by this term of kindred, St Paul asks the Colossians, "If he [Mark] come unto you, receive him." But in his Second Epistle to Timothy (iv, 11) the Apostle writes to his correspondent thus:

> Only Luke is with me. Take Mark, and bring him with thee; for he is profitable to me for the ministry.

And in the short Epistle to Philemon (24), among those from whom St Paul sends salutations, occurs one whom our translators name Marcus, but who is the same that in the other epistles appears under the Anglicized form of Mark. It is also far from trivial that Lucas (Luke), as well as

Mark, is named among those from whom Paul sends salutations, and who are described as his fellow-labourers; that is to say, that two of the four evangelists of our canon were attendants on St Paul in his travels, which is not likely to have been the case. The terms in which these persons are named by St Paul have been quoted in full in a former page (30); and these three are the only notices that St Paul takes of any one bearing the name of Mark. There is, then, great uncertainty, almost amounting to an impossibility, against our belief that the John Mark who is four times named in the Acts is the same who is three times referred to in the Epistles of St Paul. In the Acts of the Apostles he appears as an adherent of Barnabas, without any notice of kindred existing between them; and his lukewarmness in preaching the Gospel not only draws on him the censure of St Paul, but ends in a severe strife between the apostles, which leads to their separating one from the other. We have no record of their ever having been again united in preaching the Gospel. It may, indeed, be thought that Barnabas was led by feelings of consanguinity to take the part of his sister's son; but in that case we might expect the historian to have stated that such was the motive. This might have somewhat lessened the unseemliness of a quarrel between two leading apostles at the very beginning of the Christian ministry. On the other hand, we have no reason assigned for the altered relation in which Mark stands, in three passages of the Epistles, to the Apostle Paul. If Mark should visit the city of Colossæ, its inhabitants are requested to receive him. Timothy, too, is requested to bring Mark with him, as an useful aid in the ministry; and in the third passage, Mark is one of the fellow-labourers of St Paul, who sends salutations from him and others to his correspondent, Philemon.

From these brief accounts of an early Christian teacher named Mark we derive no grounds for inferring that he is the same who is said by tradition to have been the author of the second Gospel; and we search in vain among other records of the first century to find grounds for holding that any gospel, such as those which we still have, was written by any contemporary named Mark at all.

The authority which is generally quoted for the received opinion is that of Papias, whose notice of Mark, quoted in full elsewhere (p. 91), certainly leads to a very different conclusion. According to this writer, Mark copied the sayings and doings of Christ, not in a regular order, but

incidentally from the mouth of Peter, whose follower he was, and in a form wholly distinct from the consecutive life of Jesus, as it appears in the second of the four gospels. We have no reason for doubting either that one of the adherents of St Paul was named Mark, or that Peter was attended by a follower bearing the same name of Mark, who noted down all that fell from Peter on the acts and sayings of Jesus. But to identify not only with each other these two, apparently so different, being followers of two apostles who were at variance, but with the writer of a book which, however valuable as a groundwork of Christianity, is not named by any writer until those two Marks must have been long dead, can hardly be allowed by any canon of criticism or of history. But we must bear in mind, what has been noticed in a former chapter, that St Peter is said to have settled in Babylon, and in his first epistle to the Jews dispersed throughout Asia he describes Mark in words which have already been quoted (p. 218), and which show Mark to have been still an adherent not of Paul, but of Peter. To this conflict of evidence must be added the statement of Eusebius, which it is difficult to reconcile with those which have gone before. He quotes the salutation contained in the epistle just mentioned, and continues his narrative as follows:

> The same Mark, they also say, being the first that was sent to Egypt, proclaimed there the Gospel which he had written, and first established churches in the city of Alexandria. [*H. E.*, ii, 16.]

Thus Mark, of whom we know nothing, even in the Gospels, becomes John Mark in the Acts of the Apostles; is termed only Mark in the three passages of St Paul's Epistles; is in the former book an adherent of Barnabas in the contention with Paul; then an adherent of Paul; and then, after the lapse of an hundred years, is said to have been at Babylon with Peter, whose teaching he is said by Papias to have reduced to writing. He is then named by Eusebius as one of the early Bishops of Alexandria, whilst his presumed connection with St Paul would sanction the belief that he was also at Rome, from which city the epistles above named are thought from the MS subscriptions to have been written. It must not be hastily taken for granted that these accounts can be literally correct. It is not probable that the John Mark who once left St Paul to follow Barnabas can have rejoined the great apostle at Rome, and

afterwards working with St Peter at Babylon, been finally raised to be a Bishop of Alexandria in Egypt.

That the same John Mark, or any one at all bearing the name of Mark, was the writer of our second Gospel, rests upon partial tradition alone. If he who bore the name of John Mark is to be preferred, we still have the anomaly that a Jew—for John is a Jewish name—adopting, as others are said to have done, a classic name, should have adopted a Latin name, and yet have written the Gospel neither in the language of his Hebrew name and origin, nor in that of the Latin name which he assumed, but in the Greek—a language almost wholly unknown to the Jews, and not adapted for an ordinary Latin—if, as some say, Mark was a Roman—to write with ease.

It may not be denied that we have in this second Gospel a faithful record of the life of Jesus, as far as the writer, whoever he was, may be concerned; but what has been above said of the Mark who alone appears in the Acts and in the Epistles of St Paul, does not seem to support the belief that he was the writer of any work at all. Eusebius (vi, 14) quotes from the Hypotoposes of Clemens Alexandrinus a passage in which the occasion on which Mark wrote his Gospel is related*:

> When Peter had proclaimed the Word publicly at Rome, and declared the Gospel under the influence of the Spirit; as there was a great number present, they requested Mark, who had followed him from afar, and remembered well what he had said, to reduce these things to writing, and that, after composing the Gospel, he gave it to those who requested it of him; which, when Peter understood, he directly neither hindered nor encouraged it.

In another place of his Ecclesiastical History Eusebius (v, 8) tells us that it was after the decease of Peter and Paul that Mark transmitted to us, in writing, what had been preached by Peter. It is difficult to reconcile these two statements, but we may be sure that, however we may be in doubt how to understand them, they were no stumbling-block to Eusebius, or to those thousands of unlearned Christians who took the letter of their creed as of equal authority with the spirit of early Christianity.

One more event may be briefly referred to and as hastily dismissed. Some commentators, wholly deficient in critical

---

* See also Eusebius, ii, 15-24; iii, 24-39.

skill, have thought that Mark was the young man, named only in the Gospel of St Mark, who came out in the early morning to see the soldiers escorting Jesus after his arrest, and, leaving his garment in their hands, fled away naked. If this were so, we should find Mark domiciliated at Jerusalem also, as well as at Rome, Babylon, and Alexandria; but there is no shadow of a reason why this young man should be thought to have been Mark at all.

The question of style, of authenticity, of the date at which the Gospel according to St Mark was written, is not part of our present subject, which is limited to the question, how far St Mark, as he appears in the New Testament, was likely or competent to write what has been ascribed to him as the second of our Gospels. However this may be determined, that Gospel is not more free from interpolation than the others. On this point, we may accept what Tischendorf says in his edition of the English New Testament (p. xiii), with the various readings, omissions, and insertions of the three oldest MSS—the Vatican, the Sinaitic, and the Alexandrian:

> By Eusebius and Jerome (the former of whom died in the year 340) it is stated expressly that in nearly all the trustworthy copies of their time, the Gospel ended with the 8th verse; and with this, of all existing Greek manuscripts, only the Vatican and the Sinaitic now agree.

From these extracts out of the New Testament we turn to other books in which the name of Mark might be likely to occur, if haply some other information may be supplied to us that will confirm or complete the brief notices which the Scriptures furnish of this evangelist.

None of these sources, however, supply any information concerning St Mark, or even mention his name or that of any other evangelist; and this is the more remarkable, as Josephus does actually mention John the Baptist, and even James, who is said to have written the Epistle which bears his name in the Christian canon. The Apostolical Fathers, also Barnabas, Clement, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, seem to have been wholly ignorant that such a man as Mark existed; and Justin Martyr, who wrote his Apology to the Roman Emperor in about the year A.D. 150, appears to have been equally ignorant of the existence of such a man as Mark. Nor do the shorter treatises of Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tatian, or Hermias, contain any references to so important a person as Mark, who must even then have

been well known if he was the writer of that Gospel which has been thought by some critics to have been the most ancient, if not the prototype of the other three. Of the other writers who date from the second century, Irenæus is the only one whose existing works show him to have been acquainted with the name of Mark as connected with one of the Gospels. In one passage he speaks of Mark and Matthew, as has been already quoted in a previous page of this work; and in a second he repeats the words with which St Mark begins, and again those words which form the 19th verse of the 16th chapter, showing that when the treatise, Against Heretics, was written, the disputed verses of that chapter had already, whether rightly or not, been introduced into the text.

2. LUKE.

The gospel, which has been handed down to us from very early times, bearing the name of Luke as its author, declares, in the preface, that it is not an original narrative by an eye-witness of the events which are therein recorded, but a compilation from the writings of others who had previously been "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (i, 2).

Of this fact there could have been very little doubt, even if no such declaration had been made; for St Luke does not appear at all in any period of the apostolic history except in company with St Paul; and even in the Pauline Epistles, his name occurs three times only, and this, too, in epistles which have not been accepted by the most learned modern critics as undoubtedly written by St Paul. Our subject at present is not St Paul, but St Luke, of whose life we have no accounts save the brief mention of his name in the three epistles above named, and already quoted in page 28 of this work. In the first of these, St Paul, concluding his letter to the Colossians, writes briefly:

Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas, greet you. [Col. iv, 14.]

In his Second Epistle to Timothy, he writes:

Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world, and is departed unto Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia, Titus to Dalmatia: only Luke is with me. [iv, 10.]

In the short Epistle to Philemon he names a larger number of adherents; among whom Lucas or Luke also appears, as

already quoted (p. 30), with nothing to guide us to the early history of this disciple. But why our translators have retained the Greek form Lucas in this only of the three passages, it is useless to enquire. All those epistles are subscribed, "Written from Rome;" but as no date is assigned to either of them, we cannot tell the order in which they were written. Only, seeing that the name of Demas appears in two of them as of one who is still in attendance on St Paul, whereas in the other he is described as having abandoned him, we may infer that Demas had either repented of his defalcation, and returned to his duties, or that he had abandoned St Paul altogether, in which case the Second Epistle to Timothy, if written by St Paul at all, was written after the other two. We gather then from this enquiry that St Luke is nowhere named as an attendant on St Paul, except at Rome; and it is generally understood, because no one has thought it worth while to dispute it, that his name Lucas is a short form of Lucanus, in the same way as they say Silas is another form of Silvanus. But there is great danger in taking any short name as an abbreviation for a longer. The name, Lucanus, nowhere is found in the New Testament; and there is no ground for believing either Lucanus to be the full name of him who is called Lucas in St Paul's Epistles, or Silas to be a short form of the name Silvanus. There is, in fact, distinct evidence that these were two different men. In nine passages of the Acts of the Apostles, we read of Silas as having for some time accompanied St Paul; in the Epistles of St Paul, however, we do not find the name occur, but a Silvanus is there mentioned with no indication that he is the same who followed Paul in his travels: he is connected with Paul and Timotheus as having preached among the Corinthians (II Cor. i, 19) and Thessalonians (II i, 1). But he is also named in the First Epistle of St Peter (v, 12) as a faithful brother by whom is sent this very epistle from St Peter at Babylon. We cannot believe that the same man was present with St Paul in his travels, and with Peter, the adversary of St Paul, at Babylon. Neither is there any authority sufficiently clear for supposing that the Luke who is there named was the writer of the third gospel or of the Acts of the Apostles. There is no authority for believing that St Luke was ever in company with the twelve disciples, or others connected with them, before the arrival of St Paul at Rome. All the three epistles in which he is named appear to have been written from Rome during the two

years that St Paul resided there, as related in the last chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. It was the opinion of Tertullian that Luke was then converted to Christianity by St Paul. He describes Luke as—

> Not an apostle, but an apostolic man; not a master, but a pupil, and as less than a master; so he certainly was so much later, as he was the follower of a later apostle—Paul without a doubt. [*Adv. Marcion*, iv, 2.]

Whatever may be thought of the earlier days of St Paul, it is clear that St Luke appears for the first time in company with him at Rome. If, therefore, he is the author of the third gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles, he wrote the whole of the gospel and the whole of the Acts, save the last part of it, of which Rome, where he was present, is the scene, on the authority of others, who told him the various events which happened during the sixty years that had passed between the birth of Jesus and St Paul's arrival at Rome.

But there are many difficulties to surmount in the question, whether St Luke wrote the gospel which bears his name; or, secondly, whether he wrote the Acts of the Apostles; and, lastly, whether he, or any other person, was the sole writer of both those books. In the case of the gospel, compared with the other three, the author has shown too much knowledge of the facts which he admits to have gathered from preceding writers. No one has asserted that either of the other three narratives was written during the time when St Paul and St Luke appear in history, and yet the language of St Luke is in many passages so exactly the same as in the other three gospels that it would seem as if one had copied from the other. This, however, can hardly be allowed to be the case: it is far more likely that all have been derived from an earlier and common source. The discrepancy between the accounts of Christ's sojourn on earth after his resurrection would, in the case of any other book, be an insuperable objection to the belief that the two books were written by the same author. In the present case, however, we are told not to rely upon this discrepancy; for the Acts of the Apostles, even more than the gospel ascribed to St Luke, bears marks which show that it is compiled from other works. It appears rather to be the work of an editor who has blended together accounts from others, one of whom, by his use of the pronoun *we*, signifies that he accompanied St Paul in his travels. It is to be

feared that whilst those who have accepted these traditions as well-founded, and reverence every word of them, have never extended their views so far as to take in the harmony of parts, and to judge of the New Testament as they would of any other book; there are some, on the contrary, who, not blindly accepting these views, have yet seen the difficulty of displacing them, and have, therefore, turned their attention to smaller points of criticism, which the general public have little time or will to examine. Yet the whole, whether of history or of doctrine, contained in the books of the New Testament may be best judged by the internal evidence which they furnish, seeing that there is no mention of their authors or of their contents for the long space of about one hundred and twenty years from the date of the crucifixion; and the interpretation, whether of fact or of doctrine, must derive its chief force from the exercise of reason, which is the common and the best attribute of all mankind.

The traditions which have come down to us, both of the third gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles, are so numerous, and the opinions so varied, that an enquiry into all the details is almost impossible, and if fully carried out, would be useless. The most important conclusion which seems probable is that the editor of the gospel was in some way connected with the Acts of the Apostles. In proof of this fact, we have hundreds of words and phrases which occur in both those works, and these have been laboriously collected and given to the public. The argument is, of course, strong; but not wholly conclusive. Similar words and phrases occur at times in all communities, and in all ages, but there seem to be no grounds for denying that the editor or compiler of the gospel may also have been the editor or compiler of the Acts of the Apostles.

We cannot forbear to refer to one peculiarity in both of these works, which has been already noticed, and which, in some degree, would seem to lessen the difficulty of tracing their origin, as contrasted with the other gospels; and yet this very feature gives us no help whatever in ascribing their authorship to St Luke. The writer of each dedicates his work to Theophilus, to whom he gives the epithet of *Kratistos*, Most Excellent, and who has been already named in our summary of the Acts of the Apostles. It may be permitted us to add here some other particulars which support the view previously taken on this subject. Among the minor writers of the second century is one named Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch; and we have a short work of his

addressed to Autolycus on behalf of the Christian faith, to which he had himself been converted late in life. It is on the authority of Eusebius (iv, 34) that the three books of the "Writing to Autolycus" are ascribed to the sixth Bishop of Antioch, or, more correctly speaking, that the Theophilus who was known to have written this work is the same who was the sixth Bishop of Antioch. In support of this, we find from the 27th section of his third book, in which he has given us a chronology of events from the creation to the time of his writing, that his work was compiled about or soon after the year 180 of the Christian era. And it is remarkable that the third book, bearing a superscription in the form of a letter, may, for that reason, be looked upon as a separate work, written at a later date than the two books which precede it. For no such superscription or form of greeting is prefixed to them; and the contents of both, whilst mostly in harmony, yet present a remarkable difference, which can only be explained by the theory that no book called a Gospel had become thoroughly known to the world when Theophilus first wrote to urge his friend Autolycus to become a Christian. In the first two books there is no mention made of any Christian work or quotation of any practice drawn from Christian sources. When Theophilus quotes the Scriptures, he means the books of the Old Testament, and with these he mixes up verses from the Sibyls, and from almost every one of the chief poets and prose writers of Greece. He who had been lately converted to Christianity, and who writes to convert his friends, does not even mention the name of Jesus Christ, or any of his apostles and disciples. Even in the third part, which, according to our view, is a separate, or at all events a later tract, the same remarks apply. The writer is conversant with the whole subject of Jewish and pagan mythology and history; but he gives only three short sentences from the gospel, and does not name the book in which these are found, or the apostolic writer on whose authority they are produced. In the first of these it is the evangelic voice, according to Theophilus (iii, 13), which cautions men to avoid adultery and divorce. In the second passage (iii, 14) it is the gospel—not a book, but the religious institution—which warns us to love our enemies; and in the third the words, he says, seem to indicate that it is God who gives us the warning about the right hand and the left. There is a fourth reference, also quite in harmony with the passage of the New Testament, about giving honour to whom honour

is due, &c., but as the warning is given us by St Paul (Rom. xiii, 7-8), it might certainly be expected that it would be quoted as coming from the great apostle who dwelt so often at Antioch, and not be introduced vaguely as dictated by the word of God. The three passages which are similar to those given by Theophilus, are all found in St Matthew's Gospel (v, 28; v, 44; vi, 3); and the fourth passage has a parallel in the Epistle of St Paul to the Romans, as just stated.

It is not an unreasonable inference from these facts that the two books contained in our New Testament were dedicated to the sixth Bishop of Antioch, and to no other person named Theophilus. It is now, with difficulty, maintained that the Christian books are of earlier date than the latter half of the second century; and Antioch was, at that time, one of the centres of Greek learning, from which all our canonical books may have come forth. With this inference from sound data, it will not be easy to attribute to St Luke the authorship of the books in question.

If it is clearly established that St Luke had never been in company with Jesus or the older disciples in their native country of Judæa, a great impediment to our belief that he was the author of the third gospel would arise from the narratives, or, as we might term them, episodes, which are therein found, and which have no support whatever from the other three gospels.

The events described in these chapters of St Luke's work, and which have no support from the other Synoptics, are some of the most important in the life of our Saviour. The first of these, indeed, concerns mostly John the Baptist; but as the mother of Jesus is here said to have been the first cousin of Elizabeth, and to have visited her at her dwelling in the hill country of Judæa, we might expect that a greater intimacy would have existed between the cousins when they met in after-life. It is difficult to understand how John the Baptist could have spoken of Jesus as he did when he baptized him in the Jordan, and could afterwards, when himself in prison, have doubted whether he was the Messiah. Not only, however, is the history of John the Baptist given us by St Luke alone, but the visit to Bethlehem of the shepherds, who kept watch at night in the fields; the song of Simeon and Anna in the Temple, the visit of Jesus to the Temple when only twelve years old, the request of James and John that they might bring down fire from heaven upon the Samaritans, the mission of the

Seventy, and the instructions given to them; the parable of the Good Samaritan, the minor events related in chapters 12 to 18, have little or no support from the corresponding Synoptics. Whence did St Luke derive his information on these points of history? It is conceivable that Matthew and John being Jews, and Mark also, if he is the John Mark named in the Acts, could have obtained a knowledge of all these things from others who, as well as they, were natives of the country in which these happened; but it is not so certain that Luke ever was in Judæa or Galilee, or ever knew anything of the Christian history until he learnt it from St Paul, about the year 60 of the Christian era. We, therefore, look for stronger evidence than we now have, in default of which, the greater number of critics, whilst recognizing the value of our third gospel, fail to see any grounds for admitting it to belong to a date sufficiently early to allow of its having been written by St Luke.

It is believed that what has here been said on the subject of St Luke, and his asserted authorship of the third gospel and of the Acts of the Apostles, together with the remarks made in our summary of the later work (pp. 34-37), may be sufficient for all ordinary purposes to the ordinary English reader. But there is a name, not occurring in Holy Writ, but in many ancient writers, which has caused great discussion about the origin of St Luke's Gospel, and, in the opinion of some, would have gone near to supersede the Gospel of St Luke altogether. Among the heretics of the first age of Christianity the name of Marcion is prominent. He is said to have compiled or published a gospel of his own, —and some have even asserted that his work was the basis of that which now passes under the name of Luke. Marcion is said to have been son of the Bishop of Pontus, and to have belonged to the Asiatic sect, although their doctrines were principally propagated at Rome. They believed in a good and an evil principle, and their rule of manners was excessively austere, so much so, that if every one acted up to them, the world would, in one generation, have been left without inhabitants. It is from some remarks found in the works of Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, and others, that the Gospel of Marcion has been thought to be a varied copy of St Luke; whilst others more reasonably think that it is a separate and independent work, like so many other apocryphal gospels which bear the name of Nicodemus, of James, and of many others. The supposed fragments of this work have been laboriously collected by Thilo and published in

his Apocrypha, from which they have been copied in the Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti (ii, 96) by the author of this volume.

The most interesting particular about this heretic is related by Eusebius (iv, 24), who tells us that Theophilus, the sixth Bishop of Antioch, wrote a treatise to refute the errors and heresy of Marcion, and that this treatise was still extant in the time of the Ecclesiastical Historian. If this be true, it is certainly one of the curiosities of literature that St Luke should have addressed to Theophilus a gospel narnative which is thought to have been either expanded from Marcion or to have been the basis of that heretic's work, and that the same Theophilus should have written a treatise expressly to refute the heresies of Marcion, and also the long work addressed to Autolycus, in which there is no allusion to any written gospel at all.

The view here taken of St Luke, as wholly distinct from the earlier Christian disciples, and belonging to the class of converts who listened to St Paul at Rome, does not lead to the inference that Luke was the writer either of the Acts of the Apostles, of whom he probably knew little, or of the gospel generally ascribed to his pen. It is true that Eusebius (iii, 4) says he was

> Born at Antioch, and by profession a physician, and familiarly acquainted with the rest of the apostles, and has left us two inspired books, the institutes of that spiritual healing art which he obtained from them.

Eusebius lived 240 years after the date of St Paul and of St Luke.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

St Paul and his Missionary Companions.

To trace the career of the great apostle, to whose labours the establishment of Christianity is mostly due, is a heavier task than any which can be undertaken in an enquiry into the lives and ultimate destinies of those who were the immediate followers of Jesus, or who, not having seen our Lord, joined the society whilst the first disciples and apostles were still alive. The few pages which were enough to convey all the facts that are known concerning Andrew, James, John, and even Peter himself, hardly show, in some cases, whether the names have been correctly assigned to those apostles or not; and in a few cases, it is still doubtful whether he to whom some name has been ascribed may be accepted as having been truly numbered among the twelve apostles. Of St Paul, or Saul, as he is first named, no mention is made in the early history of Christianity until the murder of Stephen the Deacon; and the notice of him even there is very slight indeed, whilst the manner in which he is brought before us shows that the writer feels he is speaking of a man too important to be passed over slightingly. The witnesses—by whom we understand those who stoned Stephen—"laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul" (Acts, vii, 58). These words imply nothing remarkable about one young man more than another. No doubt there were many young men engaged in that murderous deed; but we then read, almost in the same breath, that "Saul was consenting to his death" (viii, 1). These words could only be spoken of some one who was well known, or who afterwards came into public notice; although five chapters still intervene before we enter upon the subject which is to occupy us during the remainder of the Acts of the Apostles. We are told in one short verse that

> As for Saul, he made havock of the church, entering into every house, and haling men and women, committed *them* to prison. [viii, 3.]

But we are left for the moment without the information that Saul, who thus persecutes the Christians, was afterwards the Paul who devoted his whole life to spread abroad their religion, and suffered so much in its defence. The events which occupy the rest of the eighth chapter have to do with Philip and Peter rather than with Saul, but in the ninth chapter the writer relates the persecution which the latter carried on against the Christians.

It was probably about the year A.D. 34 that Paul first appears under the name of Saul in abetting those who put to death the Deacon Stephen. We have no means of judging how long after that must be placed his journey to Damascus, and his miraculous conversion by the way. The chronology of the Acts is, indeed, almost wholly doubtful; nor can we fix on any positive date to which any of the events there related can be assigned. However, then, we may attempt to place the mission of Saul, the sole fact to which it led—namely, the conversion to Christianity of him who had been its chief persecutor—has come down to us in three accounts, all contained in the book of the Acts of the Apostles, and not mentioned in any other book for the space of an hundred and twenty years after his death.

The first mention of it in the Acts is in the words not of Paul, but of the author of the book; and the fact is afterwards twice described in the same book by St Paul himself, first in a speech to the people of Jerusalem, and again in his defence before King Agrippa. The three accounts here follow, for the sake of comparison, in parallel columns:

Acts, ix, 3-9.	Acts, xxii, 6-11.	Acts, xxvi, 12-16.
3. As he journeyed, he came near Damascus:	6. As I made my journey, and was come nigh unto Damascus	12. As I went to Damascus with authority and commission from the chief priests,
and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven:	about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me.	13. At mid-day, O king, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and them which journeyed with me.
4. And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto	7. And I fell unto the ground, and heard a voice saying	14. And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a

him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?"

5. And he said, "Who art thou, Lord?" And the Lord said, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: *it is* hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

6. And he trembling and astonished, said, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

And the Lord *said* unto him, "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do."

7. And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man.

8. And Saul arose from the earth; and when his eyes were opened, he saw no man: but they led him by the hand, and they brought *him* into Damascus.

9. And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink.

unto me, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?"

8. And I answered, "Who art thou, Lord?" And he said unto me, "I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest."

9. (See after ver. 10.)

10. And I said, "What shall I do, Lord?"

And the Lord said unto me, "Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do."

9. And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me.

11. And when I could not see for the glory of that light, being led by the hand of them that were with me, I came into Damascus.

voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? *It is* hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

15. And I said, "Who art thou, Lord?" And he said, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest.

16. But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee."

There are, in these three accounts, points of agreement and of disagreement which require to be noticed. The time was about noon or mid-day, and the sun being at its highest, would no doubt strike upon the earth with all its force. What, then, was the great light which suddenly shone forth "above the brightness of the sun," as we read in the third of our three narratives, and shining round about Saul and all who were journeying in his company? We have not their evidence, and, therefore, must confine ourselves to St Paul's own words. A light which strikes on a man brighter than the full blaze of a mid-day sun in the hot country of Syria, must have taken effect internally and subjectively rather than from without, or the same effect would have been felt by those who were in company with Saul; but we are not told that they felt any permanent effect. If this were so, it would appear that the Divine counsels were brought about by one of those sun-strokes which have often befallen travellers in the hot climates of the East—in this case for the purpose of communicating to Saul the intentions of the Almighty, which he fashioned into words such as his enthusiastic mind would readily suggest to itself. But there is not perfect agreement as to the effect on Saul's companions. In the two earlier accounts he alone is said to have fallen to the earth, and the men which journeyed with him stood speechless; whilst in the third narrative he says, "when we were all fallen to the earth;" and again, according to the first two authorities, there is another disagreement; for in one of them the men heard a voice, but saw no man; in the second they heard not the voice of him that spake to Saul. However these discrepancies may be explained, it is tolerably certain that a severe stroke was suddenly inflicted on Saul, and that his companions, themselves unharmed, led him by the hand, unable to see, into Damascus.

During the three days which Saul passed, blind and fasting, another vision was granted to one Ananias, a disciple, which means a Christian, living in Damascus. He was directed in his vision to seek in the house of one Judas, residing in a street called Strait, for one called Saul of Tarsus, "for, behold, he prayeth." In confirmation of this order, Ananias is told that Saul also has seen a vision of a man called Ananias coming to him and placing his hand on him (Saul), that he might receive his sight. We have no separate account of these visions; but all this was done according to them, and the effect on Saul was instantaneous.

Immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized. And when he had received meat, he was strengthened. Then was Saul certain days with the disciples which were at Damascus. [ix, 18-19.]

The events thus related would hardly leave room for gainsaying, and we are not surprised that Paul preached Christ in the synagogues; but that he "confounded the Jews which were at Damascus" (22), must be understood with some limit, for those very Jews took counsel to kill him, and watched the gates day and night. That a large number of Jews were opposed to the new doctrine which he taught is clear from the way in which the brethren saved him from the danger. "They took him by night, and let him down by the wall in a basket" (ix, 25). Of this adventure nothing is said in the Epistle to the Galatians, nor, indeed, of his safe arrival at Jerusalem after he had escaped from the conspiracy of the Jews at Damascus.

§ 1. *Paul's First Visit to Jerusalem.*

The narrative of the Acts continues in these words:

When Saul was come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples: but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple. [ix, 26.]

It is not to be wondered at that the disciples at Jerusalem were unwilling to receive among them one who had been so open an enemy and so fierce an oppressor of their community. In this state of things, we read that Barnabas introduced him to the disciples, explaining to them how

He [Saul] had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus. And he was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem. [Acts, ix, 27.]

The disciple to whose mediation Saul is here said to have owed his first interview with the apostles has, up to this time, been once only named in the Acts of the Apostles (iv, 36), where we are told that he was a Levite of Cyprus, that his original name was Joses, to which the apostles added Barnabas, Son of Consolation, and that he was one of those who promptly sold their land, and brought the money and laid it at the apostles' feet. This fact would, no doubt, give much weight to any request which Barnabas might urge on the consideration of the Christians; but there

is a great difficulty in connection with this part of the history, and whilst volumes have been written about it, no sufficient explanation has as yet been given.

St Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, writes that after his conversion he acted very differently from the account given in the Acts: he says:

> Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood: neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me; but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother. Now the things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not. [GAL. i, 16-20.]

It has been the practice of English commentators to admit both these accounts, and to ignore by some rule, which true criticism does not sanction, the discrepancy which few can read the books without perceiving. It has been the practice of German commentators to recognize the difficulty fully, and to explain it by rejecting altogether the Acts of the Apostles, as unworthy to be received in opposition to St Paul's own narrative as told in his own original letter, which they assume to be both truthful and authentic. It is not, however, by either school of criticism that such contradictions as lie between the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Galatians can be got over. St Paul's oath before God, that he lies not, must not be received as settling so important a question. The Epistle to the Galatians, if written by Paul, was not written until twenty years, and perhaps many more, after the conversion of the writer; for he says that it was fourteen years after his first visit before he again went up a second time to Jerusalem (GAL. ii, 1); and it was three years, besides the time he spent in Arabia, between his conversion and his first visit to the Jewish capital. On the other hand, we have in the Acts three different statements of what followed immediately after the conversion, as well as of the conversion itself. The Book of the Acts has clearly been compiled out of various original memoranda, and the three accounts of St Paul's conduct probably are derived each from a different source, and so invested with threefold authority. The incidents are nearly the same in all the three accounts which have come down to us in the Acts. The writer or compiler of that work tells a story which is highly probable and trustworthy as regards most of the details. We are, indeed, checked in some degree by our inability to understand the numerous visions

which are attached to the narrative, and which will meet us at every step in all that remains about St Paul in the history, or written by him in his own epistles, and which can hardly be explained otherwise than by supposing him, especially enthusiast as he was, to have retained the spirit of his Israelitish forefathers in referring his own mental impulses to a direct and personal communication from God.

But when he sought the companionship of the apostles at Jerusalem, they would naturally be suspicious of deception, and the intervention of the zealous and trustworthy Barnabas alone might speedily remove their suspicion, whilst Saul would naturally wish to have his conversion certified and approved. In the two speeches of Paul at a later period, both when he addressed the people from the steps of the temple, and again in his speech before King Agrippa, the narrative is consistent, in harmony with the former extract from the Acts, and not in harmony with the Epistle to the Galatians. In his address to the people of Jerusalem, he says that Ananias, having restored Saul to sight, continued his mission by addressing Saul in these words:

> And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. [xxii, 16.]

To go into Arabia, thence back to Damascus, and only at the end of three years to report himself at Jerusalem, the centre of the new religion which he was told to preach, would hardly be in obedience to the instructions of Ananias; nor can we believe that Saul acted in the manner recorded in the epistle. He continues his address to the people:

> And it came to pass, that, when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance. [xxii, 17.]

In harmony also with this, in his address to King Agrippa, some years later, he says:

> Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision; but showed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance. [xxvi, 19-20.]

Following, then, the simple narrative of the Acts, as represented in the direct words of the writer, we find that Saul remained some time in Jerusalem, "coming in and going out," as it is termed, with the Christians, and directing his disputation against the Grecians or Hellenistic Jews. Nor

are we surprised to read that they "went about to slay him" (ix, 29). It is generally thought that the Deacon Stephen belonged to the reforming or Hellenistic party among the Jews, and, as such, drew on him the enmity of those who were orthodox and bigoted among his countrymen. As Saul had joined the party which persecuted Stephen, so now that party, having gained influence in the city, combined to exact vengeance on him who had taken the lead in persecuting them.

Which when the brethren knew, they brought him down to Cæsarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus. [Acts, ix, 30.]

It is far from improbable that the reforming Jews at Jerusalem had become more numerous than when St Stephen was put to death; but it is also probable that the whole body of Jewish Christians in that city had become reconciled to the amalgamation of Judaism and Christianity, which is so apparent in the progress of the religion. In other words, the hierarchical notions of Judaism were spreading among the Christians of Jerusalem, and so, both in that city and in Damascus, there was little scope for an enthusiast like Saul, energetic, zealous almost to fanaticism, and bearing, as he believed, a commission from our Lord himself to preach both to Jews and Gentiles, "to bear His name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel" (ix, 15). The career of St Paul, from first to last, shows that the antagonism of the Jewish Christians to the apostle of the Gentiles, begun by his own assertion of independence, and refusal to conform to the views of orthodoxy inculcated at Jerusalem, was never healed.

We read that from this time, Saul having gone down to Cæsarea, and thence to Tarsus, the churches throughout all Judæa, Galilee, and Samaria, had rest for a time; and the writer of the Acts takes the opportunity of relating St Peter's tour among the Gentiles, with the conversion and baptism of Cornelius, the centurion, who is held up to us as the first Roman officer converted to the Christian faith.

It will be remembered that the death of Stephen was followed by a great persecution "against the church which was at Jerusalem, and that they were all scattered abroad throughout the region of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles" (viii, 1). The cause of the peace which now prevailed seems to have been that the party of progress had for the moment been checked, but not exterminated; and the

apostles who remained at Jerusalem took advantage of the opportunity to spread their influence, by means of Peter, Philip, and others, over the provinces inhabited by their countrymen, the Jews. The history of Paul is here again interrupted to make room for the account of Peter's preaching to the Gentiles, the vision which he saw from heaven, and his recital of this to those who still adhered to circumcision and other Jewish customs, when he returned to Jerusalem. It was difficult to answer Peter on this head, and his accusers "held their peace" (xi, 1-18).

Meanwhile the ground was being prepared for the future preaching of Saul. Some of those who had fled after the death of Stephen came to Antioch, and "spake unto the Grecians [*Hellenists*], preaching the Lord Jesus." Tidings of this reached the ears of the church at Jerusalem, who, acting as the Church in our own times acts, were unwilling to leave these new proselytes to themselves, lest they should stray like sheep into by-paths, and therefore they sent Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch. We may believe the character of Barnabas as he is here described:

> He was a good man, and full of the Holy Ghost and of faith; and much people was added unto the Lord. [xi, 24.]

The quiet state of the church at Antioch was no doubt due in great part to the zeal, tempered with discretion, of Barnabas; and he thought it now a good opportunity for fetching Saul from Tarsus. These two apostles then spent a whole year at Antioch, assembling themselves with the church, and taught much people. Thus the city of Antioch stands out in remarkable contrast with Jerusalem; "and the disciples were called," or, as perhaps the Greek may be equally well translated, "called themselves Christians first in Antioch" (xi, 26).

At what period of early Christianity, and from what cause so interesting an incident arose, we should much like to have been informed, but no date of these events has been recorded; the name, however, would seem to have been given them somewhere about the time to which the history has arrived: for it was in those very days that prophets came down from Jerusalem, and amongst them one Agabus, who foretold that there would be a severe dearth throughout all the world; and the author of the Acts adds, that this dearth came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar, some time between A.D. 41 and A.D. 54, during which years the reign of the Emperor Claudius was included. The

warning did not fail to arouse the charitable feelings of the Christians, who at once made a subscription for their poorer brethren in Judæa, and sent it to Jerusalem by the hands of Barnabas and Saul (xi, 30). When these had fulfilled their mission, they returned to Antioch, taking with them John, whose surname was Mark (xii, 25). This was

§ 2. *Paul's Second Visit to Jerusalem.*

And it seems to have been very short, because perhaps the leaders of Christianity were less willing than before to admit him into their counsels, or, on the other hand, himself saw no advantage to be gained from holding any further communication with them. The whole year during which Barnabas and Saul taught the people at Antioch must be taken as not comprising all that had happened up to their return from Jerusalem. But we are here met by St Paul's own account of his first visit to Jerusalem already quoted from the Acts, but absolutely denied *totidem verbis* in the Epistle to the Galatians. According to a reasonable calculation of time since his first visit immediately after his conversion as above related from the Acts, and assuming the truth of it, Paul's admission that after three years he did go up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days, and saw no other than James, we may reasonably conclude that Paul, writing many years later, made one only visit out of the two, forgetting the events which might, if remembered, have saved future commentators from expending so much time and ingenuity to harmonize conflicting statements.

How long Barnabas and Saul, with their new coadjutor John Mark, remained at this time preaching the Gospel in Antioch, we are not informed; but are much surprised that the narrative which follows, in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts, seems to ignore all that has been said about Barnabas bringing Saul from Tarsus, and their charitable mission to Jerusalem, followed by their return to Antioch. We are now told, as if it were hitherto unknown, that "there were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers." The passage has been given already in page 25; and this abrupt transition from the mention of Barnabas, Saul, and Mark, as engaged in an active work of charity, to the general statement that there were such persons dwelling among others at Antioch, leads to the very reasonable inference that the thirteenth chapter is the first of a new

document joined somewhat abruptly to a former treatise, in the way which would be most obvious to compilers who wished to form a continued narrative, and used the most obvious means without any attempt to produce an artistical effect.

Whether this may have arisen from a misplacement of several original documents, or from any other accidental cause, we are not surprised that those, who have been hitherto so industrious in preaching the Gospel, should now be deputed by the brethren, acting under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, to make a missionary journey into various districts of Asia Minor, and the neighbouring countries and cities.

§ 3. FIRST MISSIONARY JOURNEY WITH BARNABAS.

Of the prophets and teachers who are named as members of the church in Antioch, Barnabas and Saul follow our narrative: the Lucius of Cyrene may, perhaps, be the same who joins Paul in the salutation sent in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (xvi, 21). Of Manaen, the foster-brother of Herod, we know nothing more; but are somewhat surprised to find one so nearly connected with King Herod associated with prophets and teachers at Antioch.

Barnabas and Saul then, who apparently up to this time were free from the diversity of practices and of doctrines which afterwards split Christianity for many years into two rival sects, starting from Antioch, made their way to Seleucia, and thence sailed to Cyprus, having also John—*i.e.*, John Mark—"to *their* minister" (xiii, 5). In this island they preached first at Salamis, the chief city, and then at Paphos, where the sorcerer Elymas, otherwise called Barjesus, trying to prevent the deputy or proconsul Sergius Paulus from hearing the Gospel, was smitten with blindness by Saul, and the proconsul "believed, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord" (xiii, 12).

It is in the course of this disputation with Elymas that we first hear of Saul's change of name. "Saul, who also *is called* Paul," is the short form of words in which this name, afterwards down to the present day so famous, is first made known to the reader; and as no reason is given for the change, it seems needless to do more than to adopt the new name of one who may be looked on, next to Jesus of Nazareth, as the greatest and most successful preacher of the Christian faith. That the apostle took the name of Paul out of respect to the proconsul of that name whom he

had converted in Cyprus, may be accepted as a surmise, but without any support whatever to establish it as a fact.

From Paphos Barnabas and his companion, whom we shall now call Paul, passed over to Perga in Pamphylia, where their minister or attendant John left them, and returned to Jerusalem. From Perga they went to Antioch in Pisidia, a city much inferior to Antioch, the capital of Syria, but yet having a colony of Jews, with a synagogue under the management of rulers as in the native country of the Jews. The missionary apostles went into this synagogue, and after the usual reading of the Law and the Prophets, they were invited, if they had any word of exhortation, to address the congregation. Paul accepting the opportunity, spoke to them of the mercies which God had bestowed upon their nation from the earliest times, concluding with the Resurrection of Christ, to whom he called on them now, under fear of divine punishment, to render worship and obedience. The Jews, it seems, left the synagogue, whilst the Gentiles, who also had come, "besought that these words might be preached to them the next Sabbath." Some, even of the Jews, were convinced by the arguments of Paul; but when the congregation assembled in the synagogue on the following Sabbath day, the antagonism between the two parties, which for so many years afterwards divided them, broke out, as far as we read in the Acts of the Apostles, for the first time. The missionaries spoke boldly in defence of their doctrine, whilst the Judaic party, on the other hand,

> Stirred up the devout and honourable women, and the chief men of the city, and raised persecution against Paul and Barnabas, and expelled them out of their coasts. [xiii, 50.]

It was necessary, as Paul and Barnabas declared, that the Word of God should be preached first to the Jews; for our Lord himself had said that he was not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But it may well be thought that some parts of St Paul's address were not calculated to meet the approbation of his Jewish hearers. "Behold, ye despisers, and wonder and perish," was hardly a mild form of speech to address to Jews. It is not found that those who already have forms and doctrines of their own are the most easily led to extend or change their creed and their practice at the will of every reforming preacher; whilst those whose minds are free from such trammels are ever ready to listen to any teaching that seems to be sound or

novel, and to bring benefit to themselves. Whilst the Jews kept aloof, many of the Gentiles, or, at any rate, "as many as were ordained to eternal life, believed" (xiii, 48). In this state of things Paul and Barnabas shook off the dust of their feet and came to Iconium.

The chief inhabitants of this city, like others, were mostly Greeks, with a large mixture of the original barbarian population among them. This was, no doubt, the case with all the Grecian colonies and municipalities established in Asia Minor. There must also have been many Jews among them; and the two missionaries went, according to their custom, into the synagogue, as they had done at Perga. The same scenes took place here also: "part held with the Jews, and part with the apostles." But here the violence was carried further than in the city from which they had been expelled.

There was an assault made both of the Gentiles, and also of the Jews with their rulers, to use *them* despitefully, and to stone them. [xiv, 5.]

The result was similar; the apostles fled to Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia. In the former of these occurred one of the most wonderful instances of the fickleness of a mob and of the uncertainty of popular favour which has ever been recorded in history. A poor man at Lystra, who had been a cripple from his birth, was listening to the apostles' preaching, and Paul, seeing, according to the usual formula, "that he had faith to be healed," restored to him the use of his feet, so that "he leaped and walked." The multitude, roused by the miracle, exclaimed that the gods had come down to them in the likeness of men; and whilst they took Barnabas for Jupiter and Paul for Mercury, the priest of Jupiter brought garlands, and prepared to offer a sacrifice of oxen to these deities newly come among them. The apostles protested with all their might against these doings, declaring that they were men and not gods; but the arrival of certain Jews from Antioch and Iconium was more powerful to counteract the fanaticism of the mob. The new-comers persuaded the people, who stoned Paul, and, drawing him out of the city, left him half-dead. Recovering from this treatment, Paul withdrew with Barnabas to Derbe, thence back to Lystra, Iconium, Antioch of Pisidia, Perga, Attalia, and so back to the greater Antioch from which they had started (xiv, 26).

The success which the apostolic missionaries met with in

their first attempt to preach the Gospel beyond the borders of Judæa, must have given great satisfaction to the whole church at Antioch. But the perils and hardships which they had to encounter in so many forms and at so many places would be sufficient to suggest a pause before another such missionary tour could be undertaken. We are told that, when Paul and Barnabas once more found themselves safe at Antioch, "they abode there long time with the disciples" (xiv, 28).

From the foregoing narrative, we may, I think, conclude that no other than John Mark accompanied the two travellers in this first missionary tour; and he, who had joined them on Paul's visit to Jerusalem, left them when they returned from Cyprus; perhaps not liking to encounter the dangers of a tour through the continent of Asia. It will be useful, in reviewing all St Paul's journeys, to mark who were in his company, that we may justly appreciate the notices of his friends which occur in the Epistles. Some of these have been set down as writers of the Acts, without any other ground than that they had been in Paul's company. We may observe, also, that Barnabas, although engaged a year with Paul in preaching at Antioch, seems to have generally resided with the leading apostles at Jerusalem, and probably was more in agreement with them than with Paul. If so, we may find it less difficult to account for the quarrel which afterwards took place, as we shall see, between the two.

From this time, however, the schism between the Judaizing Christians of Jerusalem and the reforming party, of which the centre was at Antioch, began to show itself.

Certain men which came down from Judæa taught the brethren, *and said*, "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." [xv, 1.]

It appears that Paul and Barnabas had much dissension and disputation with them about this matter, and it was agreed that these two should go up to Jerusalem to confer with the apostles and elders about it.

§ 4. *Paul's Third Visit to Jerusalem.*

That the original disciples of Jesus fixed their residence in the Jewish capital, from which they endeavoured to extend a kind of episcopal authority over those who, at a distance, embraced the Christian religion, is wholly in agreement with the notices of their doings which we find in the Book of Acts. They alone remained in that city after

the death of Stephen, and they are now found sitting in conclave, when Paul and Barnabas came before them to discuss the obligation to circumcise converts. We find in the Epistle to the Galatians that "James, Cephas [*i.e.* Peter], and John, who seemed to be pillars" of the church, were on all occasions residing nowhere than in Jerusalem, and, no doubt, remained there until the Jewish nationality was broken up not many years later, when a remnant found refuge at Babylon and other countries beyond Judæa.

The way to Jerusalem lay through Phœnicia and Samaria, where the Gospel had already been preached, and the news of what had been done by Paul and Barnabas caused great joy among the brethren of those countries. There might also have been joy equally unalloyed among the brethren in the capital city, were it not that

> There rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command *them* to keep the law of Moses. [xv, 5.]

The apostles and brethren met together, and Peter first addressed them, showing how he had first successfully preached the Gospel among the Gentiles, and that God had put no difference between them and the Jews, "purifying their hearts by faith." Why, then, should be placed on the necks of the disciples a yoke which neither they nor their fathers had been able to bear? The argument was unanswerable: Paul and Barnabas declared what miracles God had wrought among the Gentiles through them; and James, acting, as we may believe, and as has from that time generally been believed, with a sort of episcopal authority, prefacing his decision with some general remarks on God's previous dispensations, brings their consultations to an end as follows:

> Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God: but that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and *from* fornication, and *from* things strangled, and *from* blood. [xv, 19-20.]

This decree was forwarded in a letter addressed to "the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia;" and one "Judas, surnamed Barsabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren," were deputed to accompany Paul and Barnabas on their homeward journey, for no very evident purpose, unless it were to inspect the brethren at Antioch and remind them that they were subordinate to

the mother church of Jerusalem. However this might be, the letter was delivered which, when the brethren had read, they rejoiced in the consolation (xv, 31); and the inspectors, after they had tarried there a short space, were at liberty to go back in peace from the brethren to the apostles. Silas, however, chose to remain at Antioch, and to take part in the ministry of Paul, but Judas, we may suppose, went back. The two who bore these names appear here for the first time in the Christian annals. Whilst, however, Silas will recur to our notice, his fellow-deputy, Judas Barsabas, appears only to add to the confusion of names by which the apostolic history is embarrassed. We first have Barsabas in Acts i, 13, where he is named as one of the candidates for the place among the twelve disciples vacated by the treason and death of Judas Iscariot. But there it is "Joseph, called Barsabas, who was surnamed Justus," whereas here it is Judas to whom the surname of Barsabas is given; and in the Epistle to the Colossians (iv, 11) the epithet of Justus is applied to a man called Jesus, *i.e.* Joshua; and we are not allowed to stop even here, for Justus appears in the Acts (xviii, 7) as the name of a man distinct altogether from the other two. Where the accounts are so embarrassed with difficulties, it is neither possible nor needful to put forth any explanation of so obscure a subject.

Our original narrative tells us that "some days after" the departure of the deputation, Paul proposed to Barnabas to make a second tour over the countries which they had formerly visited. We have seen (p. 304) that this led to the quarrel and separation between the two, and perhaps to other results of which no record has been preserved. From Cyprus, whither Barnabas retired, we have no notice of his ever having returned; and it is not beyond the scope of probability that it was his connection with the island as much as Paul's which brought it so much into notice in the accounts of that age which have come down to us.

From this time we read no more of Barnabas in the apostolic history. His name occurs twice only, incidentally, in St Paul's Epistles. In one of these passages (Gal. ii, 1, 9-13), he describes a man named Marcus, perhaps John Mark, as sister's son to Barnabas; and in the other place (I Cor. ix, 6) he simply refers to the missionary tour which they had made together. These short notices both of Barnabas and of Mark, as before related, throw no light whatever upon the later career of the two disciples who leave St Paul at this time.

The epistles in which they are named are wholly without dates, and which of them was written before the others, if indeed they were written by the apostles at all, cannot now be ascertained for certain. Whether some of them were written by them at all, was admitted to be doubtful, even by the earliest Christian writers who dealt with these critical questions. But we may take it for certain that the epistles of St Paul at least were written later than the time when his first missionary tour was made, and most probably not before he finished his missionary labours, and enjoyed a repose of two years at Rome. It is, therefore, remarkable that St Paul, who resented Mark's desertion of their ministry at this time, and in his resentment contended so sharply with Barnabas, that the two apostles parted company, never again to meet, should now, writing from Rome, name him in three of his epistles, and even request Timothy to bring him, as a man who was profitable to him for the ministry.

The departure of Barnabas from St Paul has been made by some a reproach not only to the two apostles personally, but also against the cause of Christianity itself, as not having inherent strength to eradicate from the hearts of its votaries those bursts of passion which in other cases have led to schisms always dangerous and sometimes fatal to the common cause. This view may be entertained by those who interpret our Scriptures as free from every taint of superstition on the one hand, or of worldly morality on the other. It must not be forgotten that at this very period of Christian progress two rival doctrines were beginning to appear, which afterwards broke out in a more violent form than the writers of our canonical books thought it wise to record. It is not unreasonable to ask a question which the want of documents makes it impossible to answer. We hear no more of Barnabas after he sailed with Mark to Cyprus. He may have carried on a mission separate from that of Paul: we have nothing to guide us to such an opinion. He may have joined that party, adverse to Paul, which advocated the retention of Jewish rites and customs, such as Paul almost everywhere found awaiting him, and everywhere tried to abolish. When, however, Paul had lost his former companion, he chose Silas to go with him on the second mission which he had in his mind, and accordingly with him he "went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (xv, 41).

§ 5. *Second Missionary Tour with Silas.*

The first places at which they stopped were Derbe and Lystra, where they fell in with a disciple named Timotheus, whose father was a Greek and mother a Jewess, which believed,—*i.e.* had become a Christian. This man was well spoken of by the brethren both at Lystra and Iconium, and Paul, wishing to have him as a companion in his travels, took him and circumcised him, "because of the Jews that were in those parts,"—a reason not altogether as conclusive to our modern notions as it may have been then, especially as the further reason is that "they all knew that his father was a Greek." It might be thought that St Paul, who was so averse to circumcision, which was so thoroughly a Jewish rite, might have forbidden rather than practised it in the case of a man whose parents were neither of them bound by any Jewish law at all. Nor does this objection become less serious when we read in the next verse:

> As they [*Paul and Silas*] went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem. [xvi, 4.]

Among these decrees, it will be remembered, circumcision is not mentioned; and if St Paul now circumcised Timothy, we must infer that he was only practising what he afterwards declared to be his policy in his Epistle to the Romans (ix, 20): "Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews." But there is a further question, how far this pliancy of conduct would sanction the deviation from a principle which might be thought paramount in the judgement of the apostle. Nor is it unseemly to remark that Timotheus, or Timothy as he is called in English, does not appear to belong in any way to the family of Paul, so as to give him the right to administer to him, a grown man, a ceremony not so safe as when applied to an infant of eight days, as the law required. It has been objected by more than one writer to the consistent integrity of Paul, that he waived his principles on several occasions in order to make converts and to increase his own personal influence.

From these towns Paul and Silas continued their journey through Phrygia and Galatia, but here their course was stayed, by what may be thought in the present day a singular source of hindrance, implying, as we might imagine, some impediment of a material nature. They were forbidden "of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia,"

i.e. in that part of Asia Minor to which was sometimes limited the name of the whole continent. They turned aside to Mysia, and finding the same hindrance to their visiting Bithynia, they came down to Troas, where a vision was seen by Paul of a man of Macedonia saying, "Come over into Macedonia, and help us." In obedience to the vision, the missionaries passed over to Samothrace, the next day to Neapolis, and thence to Philippi; and here the writer or compiler of the book, having up to this point used the historical third person, now assumes the character of being one of Paul's companions. He continues the narrative thus:

And after he [Paul] had seen the vision, immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had called us for to preach the gospel unto them. [xvi, 10.]

The writer speaks in the first person only for seven verses, and then he resumes the style of an historian relating what was done by others.*

Of the book, or at least of this part of the Book of Acts, the writer says:

We were in that city abiding certain days. [xvi, 12.]

It was here that "Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira," listened to the preaching of Paul, and was baptized with her whole household; after which she constrained him, with his whole company, to come into her house and abide there. But even in this simple story we find it difficult to understand what a more complete account would perhaps have explained to us. Lydia is described as one "who worshiped God" before she heard the preaching of Paul; and it would be satisfactory to know whether the worship of the true God was derived from a Jewish source, or from some general theory of monotheism, superseding the decayed religions of the ancient world. There was a house of prayer outside of the city of Philippi, and near the river, where the Christian teachers seated themselves, and taught whoever came to pray. Whilst on their way to this place, they were followed by a damsel possessed with a spirit of divination, who cried after them, saying:

These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation.

* There are only two other divisions of this book, in which the author writes as if a companion of St Paul--Chapters xx, 5—xxi, 16, and Chapter xxi, 1, to the end of the book.

Paul, turning to the spirit which was supposed to have possession of the damsel, commanded him to come out of her; and he came out the same hour. But in doing this they offended her masters, who saw that their hope of gain was gone; for probably they used this woman's supposed prophetic power in the same way as the priestesses are said to have done in the different temples of Greece and Rome. The multitude was stirred up against them; the magistrates took part with the people, and having scourged Paul and Silas, threw them into prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks. In this strait nothing but a miracle could rescue them; and their rescue was not far off. Paul and Silas prayed to God at midnight:

And suddenly there was a great earthquake, so that the foundations of the prison were shaken: and immediately all the doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed. [xvi, 26.]

We are reminded, when reading this miracle, that a similar imprisonment, followed by a similar miraculous rescue, had befallen St Peter; and we, therefore, need not wonder that in the present instance, the keeper of the prison, knowing the severe penalty inflicted for allowing prisoners to escape, was on the point of killing himself with his own sword, when Paul cried with a loud voice, and assured him that they were all safe. The gaoler was not only reassured, but declared his belief in a religion which was supported by such mighty power, and was himself baptized with his whole house. What followed would have raised a doubt in the mind, but the narrative is thoroughly consistent with itself, even if the miraculous earthquake be eliminated. We should have wondered that the keeper of the prison ventured to remove the apostles to his own house, to wash their stripes, and to set meat before them. But when it was day, there came sergeants from the magistrates, saying, "Let those men go!" The scene was now laid, not before an arbitrary tyrant, as in the case of Peter, but in a city of free men, whose faith and consciences were in their own keeping; and the magistrates would, perhaps, like Gallio, see no great harm in leaving religious matters to take their course; and so, the riot of the preceding evening having died away, reason resumed its force in the morning, and it was determined that the prisoners should be released. But the prisoners would not accept their release on such simple terms; they demanded, and obtained their demand, that the magistrates, having

unlawfully beaten and imprisoned men who were Roman citizens, should come themselves and escort them out of prison. All this was done; Paul and Silas, having said farewell to Lydia and the brethren, departed out of the city.

Reflecting on this episode in the career of Paul, we find that some German critics have availed themselves of the miraculous agency by which both Peter and Paul were freed from prison to show that the Acts of the Apostles is not a truthful history, but was put forth at a time when it was necessary to blend, if possible, all the various sects of Christianity into one compact and powerful body. This, they suppose, might be done if it were shown that there was less divergency between the Pauline and the Petrine doctrines, and that the career of both in preaching the Gospel was exposed to the same hardships and dangers, and encouraged by the same divine and even miraculous favour, as they are described in the Book of the Acts. In order, therefore, to lower the authority of this book, they elevate the Epistles of St Paul, forgetting that it is much easier to forge didactic than historical writings. To set aside the history contained in the Acts of the Apostles would cut off the whole of the Gospel history from its present fourfold moorings, whilst the Epistles of Paul would float away into obscurity from our want of knowing the antecedents from which alone our knowledge might be derived. In asserting that the Book of the Acts aims rather at conciliating the teaching of St Paul with that of Peter than at presenting a truthful history, these critics have repudiated miracles altogether, forgetting that the boundary between miracles and ordinary facts is not obvious to every one, and, indeed, is not in itself very strongly marked. It therefore becomes necessary to judge of the Acts of the Apostles distinct from the miracles which to a very unusual number it contains. It is quite open to question the reality of a large number of miracles, whether in the New Testament or elsewhere, but to upset the general truth of what we read in our canonical books will lead to an issue which will be found to be difficult and deplorable.

When the missionaries, Paul and Silas, left Philippi, they passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia to Thessalonica, where was a Jewish synagogue (xvii, 1). Here they met with some success among the Jews, but more among the Greeks; and the greater number of Jews, who did not believe, set the city in an uproar, and assaulted the house of one Jason, who, having probably been converted, had

received the missionaries into his house. The mob clamoured that the apostles should be given up to them, for that they wished to set up Jesus as king instead of Cæsar; and this so alarmed the magistrates that, having obtained some kind of satisfaction from Jason, they let the apostles go. Such was the result of three Sabbath days, during which Paul reasoned with the people in the synagogue of Thessalonica. From thence they went to Berœa, where the people are described as being

> More noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so. [xvii, 11.]

The success was consequently great at Berœa, especially among the honourable women, as has been the case ever since where the seeds of religion have been sown, and "of men," says the writer with equal truth, "not a few." This, however, was not of long continuance. The Jews of Thessalonica followed them to Berœa, and began to stir up the people against them. The brethren therefore seem to have quieted the multitude by sending Paul down to the sea-coast, where he took ship for Athens, leaving instructions that Silas and Timotheus, who had joined his company after circumcision at Lystra, should follow him with all speed whither he should go.

The temporary separation of Paul from his trusty followers was no doubt painful to the apostles, and has, it may briefly be remarked, been the basis on which certain attempts have been made to harmonize some parts of the epistles. Silas and Timotheus, as we are informed farther on, rejoined Paul at Corinth, to which city he had gone after he had met with indifferent success, as he perhaps might have expected, in Athens. This city was the very centre and stronghold of Grecian learning; and as Paul had everywhere found the Gospel to be a stumbling-block to the Jews, so here he found it to be to the Greeks foolishness. This is the view taken in the First Epistle to the Corinthians (i, 23), which, whatever was its date, was certainly not written until long after this first visit to the city of Corinth.

But, recurring to Paul's arrival and sojourn without his companions, Silas and Timotheus, we find that it was impossible for him to await their coming in idleness, especially where all his religious notions were offended by the customs and, as he viewed it, the dissolute lives of the people.

His spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry. Therefore disputed he in the synagogue, and with the devout persons, and in the market daily with them that met with him. [xvii, 16.]

It cannot be denied that St Paul was acting in a way which would be likely to offend the people of Athens, and to render his hearers less inclined to listen to the strange doctrines which he taught. The people who met him may have been divided in their interpretation of what they heard, but all would agree that it was a strange doctrine, wholly opposed to the easy polytheism of the age. But in Athens the very mob was not the same ignorant multitude as in other cities, and the report of what was going on in the streets was speedily carried to the ears of the upper classes.

Certain philosophers of the Epicureans, and of the Stoics, encountered him. And some said, "What will this babbler say?" other some, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods:" because he preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection. And they took him, and brought him unto Areopagus, saying, "May we know what this new doctrine, whereof thou speakest, is?" [xvii, 18-19.]

The doctrine which St Paul taught was opposed not only to the Jews whom he encountered in the synagogue, but to the native Athenians whom he met in the streets. It was a novel doctrine to the Jews that a man who had been crucified should be said to have risen from the dead, and assumed the character of their Messiah; and it was a novelty to the Athenians to be told that any one had risen from the dead at all. And it is certain that the Jews did not universally believe, any more than the Athenians, the doctrine of a resurrection; so that St Paul, speaking before an assembled multitude at Athens, might find it necessary to follow the method, which he afterwards, as has been said, declared in his epistle, of becoming all things to all men, that he might gain all men. It had been necessary for him, in addressing Jews, to refer to the religious belief and practice of the Jews; but here at Athens his audience consisted of intellectual and perhaps learned men, in whose ears all reference to Jewish laws and ceremonies was nugatory; but it was the object of St Paul to teach them that one Almighty God had created the world and them, and that Jesus the Son of God had been raised from the dead, as a token that they and all mankind

would hereafter be raised from the dead, and be judged by his Son according to their works. This being the doctrine which St Paul had to teach, he began by availing himself of what might be called a rhetorical artifice, perfectly lawful if understood to have been used as such, and without any intention of deceiving the people. St Paul, in walking through the city, had seen an altar erected *Agnōstō Theō* (To an unknown God). To fully understand this inscription, we must remember that almost every spot in the world was supposed by the ancients to be under the protection of some local deity, whether nymph of the woods, or god of a river, faun, satyr, or other being intermediate between mankind and the greater gods, Jupiter, Juno, Neptune, and others, to whose care the greater and more important divisions of the world and of nature were assigned. It was customary to affix some mark to any spot where any remarkable (perhaps miraculous) event had happened, as still in most Christian countries a cross is set up to mark a place where some murder has been committed. We may then fairly conceive that the altar which Paul saw had been dedicated to some deity, with whose name and attributes those who set it up were not fully acquainted. St Paul therefore made use of a lawful device of illustrative rhetoric when he says: "I saw an altar erected to some unknown god: now I preach unto you the God whom you do not know; it is the great God who made heaven and earth." But if St Paul meant what he said, he made use of a mode which many men would not sanction, as tending to recognize the polytheism of the age. From this beginning Paul enlarges on the power of God, of the creation, and maintenance of the world and of its inhabitants; but when he diverged from this to the resurrection from the dead, the scene was immediately changed.

When they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked: and others said, "We will hear thee again of this *matter*." So Paul departed from among them. Howbeit certain men clave unto him, and believed: among the which *was* Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them. [xvii, 32-34.]

Of the Dionysius and Damaris here named as converted to Christianity by St Paul, no further mention is made in the New Testament. The epithet attached to the name of the former gives us no clear information. The Areopagite might be a judge in the court of the Areopagus, possessing

little or no authority perhaps, since the introduction of Roman law and of Roman courts of law into every province of the Roman empire; or it may describe a mere residence in the neighbourhood of the small hill which lay within the walls of Athens, and was dedicated to the god Mars (*Ares*). The Dionysius who is here designated as the Areopagite is named by Eusebius, who tells us in his Ecclesiastical History (iii, 4; iv, 23), quoting from the other Dionysius who was Bishop of Corinth about the year A.D. 170 (p. 80), that this Dionysius the Areopagite became afterwards the first Bishop of Athens. Such antecedents as these were not likely to pass unnoticed by those who wrote about the early Church; and it would be difficult to find a more gigantic forgery than that of which he has been made the subject.

In a later age Suidas, to whom a valuable Greek Lexicon is ascribed, has given us some more information about this Dionysius, but no authorities are quoted in support of his statements. Dionysius is described as a proficient in Grecian literature, and as having observed in Egypt the eclipse of the sun, which is said to have occurred during the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, upon which occasion he is reported to have said, "Either God himself is suffering, or he sympathizes with some one who is suffering." The legend adds that on his return from Egypt to Athens, he became a member of the court of Areopagus, and derived his surname from that circumstance. We are further told that he suffered martyrdom of the most cruel and painful kind; but we are not told how this was brought upon him, seeing that, as a member of the highest court at Athens, he would hardly have been put to death as a criminal, or we should have had at least some faint tradition of a fact so extraordinary. But all these stories are mere legends, and would be unworthy of notice if it were not the fact that a large number of treatises have been handed down to our own days, ascribed to Dionysius as their author. These writings are of a mystical nature, and certainly are as late as the sixth century of our era. They were translated into Latin by the Scottish Erigena, and were at one time thought to be of as great value and as thoroughly genuine as any ancient writings, and even as the books of the New Testament itself. The scholastic theology of the middle ages, which extended into every country of Europe, derived much of its authority from these spurious books, and now, in company with them, is slumbering on the shelves of libraries, from which the next step, it is hoped, will be to exterminate them altogether.

Returning to the history of St Paul, we find him next at Corinth, where Silas and Timotheus rejoined him, and where the former of these disappears from our sight, being not named in any of the epistles ascribed to Paul; for the Silvanus who is there three times named must be wholly set aside as a different man altogether; the two names Silas and Silvanus having no affinity, much less identity, with each other. The name of Timotheus occurs once more, as we shall see, in the Book of the Acts, and is named afterwards in no less than eight of St Paul's epistles.

We find, then, that St Paul, when he retired from Athens to Corinth, was rejoined by both of his former companions, and remained in that city "a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them." So long a sojourn at one place would naturally lead to a wider knowledge of the people than could be gained by a short and hasty visit.

That Paul still adhered to his Jewish nationality has been shown in all the places where he stopped during both of his missionary tours; but at Corinth he fell in with a Jew named Aquila, who was born in Pontus, and had lately come with his wife Priscilla from Italy. This man being a tent-maker, Paul, who was of the same craft, took up his abode and carried on his trade in their house (xviii, 2). The mention of these fugitives from Italy is involved in some obscurity, which will be rendered still more dense if we allow conjecture to add statements for which no support can be found in facts. It is said that Aquila and Priscilla left Italy because the Emperor Claudius had ordered all Jews to depart from Rome. The decree is briefly alluded to by Suetonius:

> He expelled from Rome the Jews who were continually creating disturbances at the instigation of Chrestos. [*Claud.* 25.]

Whether Chrestos is Christ, or what otherwise the words of Suetonius mean, is left to the judgement of readers, as nothing occurs in any ancient writer to furnish its meaning. But we learn from Dion Cassius (lx, 6) that it was found impossible to enforce this decree against a body of men so numerous as the Jews, and that it ended in the prohibition of Jewish meetings. Whatever may have been the cause of Aquila and Priscilla leaving Italy—and it is not expressly stated that they came from Rome—they seem to have not only supported Paul in his ministry, but to have acted independently of him, as we shall presently see, at Ephesus. Meanwhile the Jews were, as usual, troublesome at Corinth,

and when they opposed Paul and blasphemed, he did not shake the dust from his feet, according to the evangelic command, but

He shook *his* raiment, and said unto them, "Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles." [xviii, 6.]

Why, however, Paul should have left his residence in the house of Aquila, we are not informed; only that he went to the house of one Justus, "who worshiped God," and therefore may have been a Christian. His house indeed "joined hard to the synagogue," which might have been convenient, if Paul intended still to admit Jews as well as Gentiles to the benefits of his ministry. He had not indeed been very unsuccessful among the people of his own nation; for Crispus, chief ruler of the synagogue, was among his converts, and many other Corinthians also believed and were baptized (xviii, 8). To this also was added a vision of a like kind to those which had been vouchsafed to the patriarchs of old:

Then spake the Lord to Paul in the night by a vision, "Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace. For I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee: for I have much people in this city."

The encouragement which this vision gave him was no doubt much supported by the assurance that he had gained many adherents in the city of Corinth; but the communication itself, here described as having been conveyed in a vision, lies quite within the range of thought suggested by a man's own consciousness, and whilst such a feeling might produce the same effect, and indeed be mistaken, especially in the thoughtful silence of the night, for words addressed to him in a divine vision, the confidence that he would find much material support in the number of his followers must have told much more in every way to strengthen him for his future task.

Notwithstanding this encouragement from the Almighty, the official and higher ranks of society did not yet fall in with the movement, which was making way among the common people. When some of the most violent brought Paul before Gallio, the proconsul, or deputy as he is termed, of Achaia, accusing him of persuading men to worship God contrary to the law, Gallio would not even allow Paul to open his mouth, saying,

If it were a matter of wrong or wicked lewdness, O *ye* Jews, reason would that I should bear with you; but if it be a question of words and names, and *of* your law, look ye *to it;* for I will be no judge of such *matters.* And he drave them from the judgement seat. [xviii, 14-16.]

The indifference of Gallio may have encouraged the Greeks, or perhaps more correctly the Gentiles, to retaliate on the Jews, for they seized Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, and beat him before the judgement seat, Gallio, with remarkable indifference, caring for none of these things.

After this Paul sailed to Ephesus, where he left Aquila and Priscilla, who had accompanied him from Corinth. He stopped on his way at Kenchreæ, a small village on the coast near Corinth, where he shaved his head, having a vow about which we should like to have been better informed. A similar vow is related more fully further on, from which alone we can very imperfectly judge of the vow which St Paul discharged at Kenchreæ. It is only of a piece with the prevalent mode of dealing with ancient history that Spencer, the author of the work on Hebrew Law (iii, 6, 1), thinks St Paul may have bound himself by a vow in order to obtain a fair wind for his voyage to Ephesus. On the other hand, the author of the Life and "Work of St Paul" (ii, 2) suggests that it may have been done in "thanksgiving for some deliverance," and that it was the vow of an ancient Nazarite. Such a conjecture is beside the mark in a survey of the life of St Paul: we know nothing more than that a vow had been made by him, and we may be satisfied that such practices are no longer in use; they can only be explained by admitting that Christianity, like other institutions, has been progressive, and that we must read the books in which its origin is traced with the same freedom of judgement which we unreservedly show in reading any other history whatever.

St Paul left Aquila and Priscilla at Ephesus; and whilst he was engaged in his own work, which will presently be described, a certain Jew named Apollos, born at Alexandria, came to Ephesus, and "having been instructed in the way of the Lord, and fervent in spirit," he began to preach among the people. Aquila and Priscilla would no doubt at once take notice of so energetic a helpmate, and they soon found out—how we are not told—that he knew only the baptism of John; whereupon "they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly." Whether this implies that they baptized him

again, we cannot tell; but he went with letters of introduction from Ephesus into Achaia, where

He mightily convinced the Jews, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ. [xviii, 28.]

Apollos is not again mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles; but his name occurs four times in the epistles, as will be hereafter noticed.

Aquila and Priscilla remained at Ephesus, but Paul, although pressed by the brethren to remain with them, declined, saying:

I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem: but I will return again unto you, if God will. And he sailed from Ephesus. And when he had landed at Cæsarea, and gone up, and saluted the church, he went down to Antioch. [xviii, 21-22.]

§ 6. *Paul's Fourth Visit to Jerusalem.*

The uncertainty of all dates of things recorded in the Acts prevents us from determining at which of the numerous yearly feasts of the Jews St Paul now wished to be present; but there is another difficulty about the passage just quoted. The Revisionists of the New Testament have omitted the words in which Paul says he must keep the feast at Jerusalem, adding, however, in the margin, the clause which they have rejected from the text. They seem in all such cases to set at naught the rule that it is easier for words to be left out of a MS by oversight than to be inserted by design, and in the present instance a very serious subject of criticism is altogether done away with. The context also of this passage is against the Revisionists: what is the meaning of "when he had gone up, and saluted the church"? Gone up, *Anabas*, is seldom used, except to the capital city, and there was no church to be saluted at Cæsarea. We must therefore conclude, with all our English commentators, that St Paul went up to the feast at Jerusalem, whatever that feast might be, and as hastily returned to Antioch, his usual place of sojourn when not absent on one of his missionary tours. But why did he leave Jerusalem so hastily that even his visit has been so briefly named by the historian? Is it not obvious that the Christian hierarchy was now so strong at Jerusalem that St Paul was now more than ever looked on as an interloper, who might come up to salute the Church, and find that the rulers of the Church were not inclined to salute *him?* They had, indeed, formerly communicated with him before the rela-

tions of the two parties were clearly marked out; but even on his former visit they had sent back with him and Barnabas two controllers, as we might call them, Judas and Silas, to see and report what was the state of things at Antioch. The state of things was now manifest, and Pauline from this time was separated from what has been termed the Petrine Christianity of Jerusalem. But it could not well be the intention of the writer to record in detail a visit to Jerusalem which led to no other result than a split between the two principal classes of the Church, and therefore the fourth visit of St Paul to Jerusalem is passed over in the brief description which we have read.

§ 7. THIRD MISSIONARY TOUR.

St Paul, after his return to Antioch, spent some time there—how long we know not. But his first act was to go over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, "strengthening all the disciples" (xviii, 23). From this point the narrative is abrupt, no record having been kept perhaps of the events which happened on this journey. It is said that "having passed through the upper coasts," by which we suppose he means the towns and countries just named, he came back to Ephesus, whilst Apollos was at Corinth, the richest city of Achaia. At Ephesus, we are told, Paul "found certain disciples;" but of this there could have been little doubt, seeing that he had been there so lately, and been asked by the brethren to stop there longer. We must therefore suppose that these certain brethren had escaped his notice, or he theirs, on his former visit. But when we read that these men, twelve in number, as we are afterwards told, acknowledged to Paul that they had never heard of there being any Holy Ghost, and had only been baptized into the baptism of John, we are surprised that two such cases of incomplete Christianity could have occurred in a city where St Paul had already formed a brotherhood, and had left two zealous disciples to maintain and continue his work. If it be admitted that two such cases might have occurred in so large a city, we must admit also that the record of them is either incomplete or fragmentary, and not such as might have been compiled by an eye-witness or a contemporary, when there would have been a wider knowledge of the facts.

These twelve new brethren were baptized again; Paul laid his hands on them; "the Holy Ghost came upon them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied" (xix, 6).

For the space of three months Paul preached boldly in the synagogue, but there were some who did not believe, and spoke against him in public before the multitude. He therefore separated the disciples, and for two years enabled both Jews and Greeks to hear the word, by disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus. During all this time "special miracles" were rife among the brethren: handkerchiefs or aprons, which had touched the body of Paul, were carried to the sick, whereupon the diseases left them, and where the disease is described as possession by evil spirits, the evil spirits went out of them. No instances of such healing, as in the case of the woman who touched the hem of our Saviour's garment, have been recorded; but it is quite possible to believe that such remedies as these were more successful than many others described as miracles; for we know that faith moves mountains, to use a biblical metaphor, not only in religion, but in the more humble department of medical science.

It must not be supposed that the two years during which Paul preached still at Ephesus were years of perfect tranquillity: he had separated from his former habits, because "divers were hardened and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude" (xix, 9). What followed, even short as is the narrative, gives us a wonderful view of the mental state of the people who inhabited such a large Grecian city as Ephesus in Asia Minor. Certain of the vagabond Jews, as they are termed in our authorized version, or 'strolling,' as they are termed without much fresh meaning in the text of the Revisionists, are the first who create disturbance. They

> Took upon them to call over them which had evil spirits the name of the Lord Jesus, saying, "We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth." [xix, 13.]

That such imitations have been made in the case of other missions and systems, whether of religious or political movements, is well known; and in most cases have arisen from the truth or belief in the truth of the prototype. But the pretensions of these Jewish imitations were followed by a catastrophe which ended in the vindication of St Paul and in their own discomfiture. Seven sons of one Scæva, a Jew, were among these vagabond or strolling Jews who tried to cast out the evil spirits. It is the belief of perhaps a large majority of Christians that the possession of a man by an evil spirit is to be regarded as meaning an attack of

epilepsy or some kindred disease which causes the patient to act in the manner which we read of in the gospels. But the sons of Scæva had to encounter an adversary of a more material kind than epilepsy; the evil spirit, whom they wished to cast out, denied their authority to act; he said, "Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?"

This disclaimer was followed by energetic action.

The man, in whom the evil spirit was, leaped on them, and overcame them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded. [xix, 16.]

This story, which has caused much difficulty to modern exponents and commentators, must have been thoroughly believed by both the Jews and Greeks dwelling at Ephesus, for we are told that fear fell upon all of them, and that the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified. We are not, however, called on to connect St Paul's own action with this thaumaturgic episode. Although not wholly free, as the trance, the vow, and the shaving of the head seem to indicate, from some of the superstitions of the age, his weightier doctrine, showing how the wickedness of mankind might be eradicated, and the spotless life of Jesus be imitated by true Christians, was likely to magnify the name of our Lord much more than the supernatural defeat of sham wonder-workers like the seven sons of Scæva.

This, however, was a mere private affair with which Paul was probably little connected. "After these things were ended" (xix, 21), he proposed in the spirit to go to Jerusalem, but first to revisit Macedonia and Achaia, where he had laboured nearly three years before.

So he sent into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timotheus and Erastus; but he himself stayed in Asia for a season.

The reason why St Paul stopped at Ephesus, delaying for awhile the missionary tour which he had contemplated, was probably that no small stir arose about this time at Ephesus. A certain silversmith who made silver shrines for Diana—possibly small models to be sold to her worshipers—was not content to see his craft superseded. He called together the other workmen, and the whole city was filled with confusion. "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" was the popular cry. Two of St Paul's companions in travel, "Gaius and Aristarchus, men of Macedonia," who have not yet been named in this history, were seized, and the people rushed into the

theatre. When St Paul wished to go in and to address them, the disciples would not let him. "Some cried one thing, and some another;" few of them knew why they were come together. The tumult seems to have been caused solely by the Greeks in support of the temple and worship of Diana; for when the Jews put forward one Alexander, a Jew, who "beckoned with the hand, and would have made his defence unto the people," the rioters, when they knew that he was a Jew, refused to hear him, repeating their former cry, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians!" What would have been the drift of Alexander's speech we can only guess from the way in which he is named in the two Epistles to Timothy. In one of these St Paul delivers Alexander to Satan, and in the other he describes him as a coppersmith who has done him much evil. We may therefore infer from this that the purport of Alexander's intended speech would have been to disconnect the Jews from the Christians, but that the Ephesian mob were unwilling to exempt from the accusation of injuring the worship of Diana the Jews whom they looked upon as near co-religionists with the Christians. The disturbance which had been begun was speedily ended by the town clerk dismissing the assembly. He seems to have been, like Gallio, a man of common sense and of liberal opinions. If Demetrius had any accusation against the Christians or any others, the law was open: they need not trouble themselves about the worship of the goddess.

What man is there that knoweth not how that the city of the Ephesians is a worshiper of the great goddess Diana, and of the *image* which fell down from Jupiter? Seeing then that these things cannot be spoken against, ye ought to be quiet, and do nothing rashly. For ye have brought hither these men, which are neither robbers of churches [*read* temples], nor yet blasphemers of your goddess. [xix, 35-37.]

The uproar was, of course, appeased by the prompt action of the town clerk, and Paul, taking leave of his Christian brethren, started for Macedonia. Nothing is recorded of his journey, save that, having exhorted the disciples in the provinces through which he passed, he came into Greece; but what part of Greece is here meant we are left to conjecture. It must, however, be remarked that the Greek name here is Hellas, and not Achaia, as in previous parts of the history, and this may arise from a different document having been followed, the more probably from the use of the first person which occurs in this part of the narrative.

There, however, may be another reason for the different name. The Roman province of Achaia was made up of the Peloponnesus, Attica, Bœotia, with the smaller states and islands that lay adjacent; whereas Hellas at this time included also Epirus and Macedonia, although repudiated by the Athenians in the more glorious days of their independence. Of Paul's doings whilst he remained in Greece we know only that he spent there three months, and that, as he was about to set sail for Syria, according to his original intention of going to Jerusalem, a plot was laid against him by the Jews, and he determined to go back, as he had come, through Macedonia (xx, 3).

We here meet with fresh names of those who were to accompany him; Sopater of Berœa (who is called in some MSS son of Pyrrhus), Aristarchus and Secundus, Thessalonians, Gaius of Derbe, Timotheus, Tychicus and Trophimus of Asia. The writer, however, tells us that "these going before, tarried for us at Troas," from which we may infer that a large number of adherents followed Paul in this missionary journey, if not in the others; and, as we know that such journeys cannot be undertaken without money or other means, it is reasonable to believe that the missionaries were aware, as St Paul himself has fully stated in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, that if they sowed among the people spiritual things, it would not be a great thing if the missionaries should reap their carnal things (I Cor. ix, 11). There is hardly any alternative to this explanation; and it is quite in harmony to believe that a company of teachers going about to propagate a better religion among an ignorant common people, would grow larger rather than smaller, from the fact that zeal for the spiritual welfare of their converts would be attended with such carnal goods as would be needful for their own maintenance. It is rare that missionaries have undertaken to preach the Gospel unless supported by their friends at home, or by contributions from those among whom they labour.

Nor is it an injustice to man's nature to believe that false teachers would arise, induced by the greater ease with which the means of subsistence would be procured by those who worked among ignorant people less informed in every branch of knowledge than themselves.

The writer, speaking still in the first person, says:

We sailed away from Philippi after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days; where we abode seven days. [xx, 6.]

It was in Troas that St Paul performed what has generally been thought to be a case of raising the dead to life; whilst others, fewer perhaps in number, have endeavoured to relieve the narrative of a miraculous interpretation, which might cause a stumbling-block to unbelievers. St Paul, taking advantage of every pause in his journeyings, preached at Troas on the first day in the week until midnight; and a young man named Eutychus, sitting in a window of the upper chamber where they were assembled, fell asleep during the sermon, as has often happened to others down to the present day, and falling from the third loft, was "taken up dead."

> And Paul went down, and fell on him, and embracing *him*, said, "Trouble not yourselves; for his life is in him." . . And they brought the young man alive, and were not a little comforted. [xx, 10-12.]

The movement with which Paul accompanied the restoration of the young man, is illustrated by that of Elijah, as related in the First Book of Kings (xvii, 21). He stretched himself three times upon the body of the widow's son at Zarephath, when he was immediately restored to life, as was Eutychus, the young man of Troas.

From this place Paul chose to go on foot to Assos, where his companions, who had gone on before by ship, were waiting for him. When they had received him on board there, they continued their voyage, passing Chios, Samos, Ephesus, Trogilium, where they tarried awhile, and Miletus. At this city, although he had passed Ephesus without landing, lest his journey to Jerusalem should be delayed, he sent a request that the Elders of the Ephesian Church would meet him. When they were met, he addressed them, calling them to witness how amid difficulties he had preached to them the whole counsel of God. "And now," he continued,

> I go bound in the spirit to Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befal me there: save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God. And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more. [xx, 22-25.]

The address in which these remarks are found is, however,

not limited to the foresight of what might befal him at Jerusalem. It is extended to exhortations that his hearers should not neglect their duty of preaching the Gospel which he had taught them; and his exhortations are in a form of words which show rather the composition of a later writer than of one who was a companion or contemporary of St Paul.

> Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. [xx, 28.]

It may be doubted whether the official terms *episcopus* and *ecclesia* were in use in the lifetime of the apostles, except among the Greek converts; and the doubt becomes greater, rather than less, by the substitution of bishop for overseer in the revised New Testament translation. It is moreover less doubtful that the word *ecclesia* was not used to denote what it now denotes—the "Church;" it is used by all classic authors for a public meeting, a calling forth of the people to attend an assembly whereas its first use among Christians was a calling out from among the heathen. It cannot be denied that the words become appropriate at a later date, when the Greeks had superseded the Jews, and Christianity appears as a Greek, not Hebrew institution; but that St Paul should exhort Ephesian teachers to act as bishops over the Church of God, looks much like a prolepsis on the part of a later writer, as in the case of many similar cases which are found in the Gospel of St John.

We cannot doubt that St Paul, judging from the evils which he had encountered in his various travels, truly foresaw that the adversaries, whom he characterizes as "grievous wolves," would rush in upon the flock which he left behind him. It might, indeed, be thought that those nations whose religion he was subverting would, with more justice, describe him as the wolf and themselves as the flock of sheep; but the depraved state of morality, politics, and religion, as has always been the case in every age of the world, inverted what otherwise would have been thought the rule and sanctioned the revolution, which has been wrought mostly by the agency of St Paul.

It is pleasing to notice the conclusion of St Paul's address: he was probably an exception to the rule, which has prevailed up to the present day, of disconnecting the teachers of religion from the practice of every trade or art by which

they might, working with their hands, obtain a livelihood among their brethren. And we must observe that St Paul practised this independent forbearance for three years during his stay at Ephesus.

I coveted no man's silver, gold or apparel. Ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have showed you all things, how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of our Lord Jesus, how he said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." [xx, 33-35.]

The saying here quoted by St Paul does not occur elsewhere, although it denotes a principle which others besides Christians might recognize.

The narrative proceeds in the first person of the writer, who apparently is one of Paul's companions—not necessarily the writer of the whole book, but of that original document which here is inserted in the work. "After we were gotten from them,"—that is, from the brethren at Miletus, —they embarked on board a ship, and sailing by Coos and Rhodes, came to Patara, where, finding a vessel bound for Phœnicia, they took their passage in it, and leaving Cyprus on their left, arrived safely at Tyre, where the ship was to unload, and "finding disciples," they tarried there seven days. Here Paul was warned not to go up to Jerusalem. He could not be ignorant that in that city prevailed not only Jewish prejudices, but also the hostility of Judaic Christians, not less dangerous to his doctrine than the natural prejudices of pure Judaism. But he was not deterred from his design: he and his company, escorted forth as had before been done wherever he had sojourned awhile, took ship for Ptolemais, and spending one day there, started the next day for Cæsarea, where they took up their abode with Philip the evangelist, one of the seven deacons, who had four daughters, described in words which we have less difficulty in understanding than in knowing what they mean, as virgins which did prophesy. Enough has been said of these daughters in former pages (189-258) of this volume.

Whilst Paul and the other missionaries were at Cæsarea, the same Agabus who had before visited them at Antioch and foretold the dearth which happened in the days of Claudius Cæsar, now again came down from Jerusalem, and binding his own hands and feet with Paul's girdle, declared that the owner of that girdle should be bound in like manner

by the Jews and delivered to the Gentiles. It may be asked whether there was not the great possibility that such might be Paul's fate even without the gift of prophecy; but it is more within the compass of this work to ask why the man who here prophesies should be described as a certain Agabus, seeing that he had already appeared as a successful prophet of the famine in the days of Claudius. It is a reasonable explanation of this, especially when added to other facts leading to the same conclusion, that the visits of Agabus from Jerusalem to Antioch and Cæsarea were related each in a different work, and when joined together to form part of the Book of Acts, retained the wording in which they had originally been written.

The prophecy of Agabus, whether one only or two bore this name, may perhaps have been no more than that foresight which has often enabled a man to foretell danger amid enemies, or a famine as resulting from war, sedition, or any other of those many evils which from time to time befal the human race. St Paul, however, was not to be shaken.

What mean ye [*said he*] to weep and to break mine heart? For I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. [xxi, 13.]

§ 8. *Paul's Fifth Visit to Jerusalem.*

The writer tells us what was the obvious issue of this firmness: Paul and his companions went up to Jerusalem, and in this last journey there went up with him some disciples who had followed him from Cæsarea, and one Mnason, a Cypriot, who, from the description given of him as an "ancient disciple," may be supposed to have joined St Paul at an early period of his ministry. He is not spoken of elsewhere in the New Testament, but probably dwelt at Jerusalem, for it is added that Paul and his company intended to lodge at his house. To indulge in conjecture whether Mnason may have been converted by Paul or Barnabas when sojourning at Cyprus or elsewhere, is needless, if not harmful, by opening the door to many other such conjectures, which may obscure rather than illustrate the known facts of the history.

On the day following, says the writer, "Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present." The interview was not wholly one of peace. The brethren of Jerusalem heard from Paul what he had done in the countries which he had visited, and they glorified God for his success; but they at the same time expostulated with him at

the sinister reports which had reached them touching his dealing with the Jews.

Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law: and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise *their* children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? The multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. [xxi, 20-22.]

To prevent the disturbance which might arise from the Jewish multitude, who, hearing that St Paul was in Jerusalem, might take the law of vindicating their customs into their own hands, it was determined that Paul should practise a curious custom of purifying four men who had taken upon themselves a vow such, possibly, as Paul had taken upon him not long before. We read in the early Israelitish history of Nazarites who took upon them certain vows, mostly of abstinence from certain meats and drinks, and the practice was continued not only down to the beginning of Christianity, but to a later time, and even—more mildly, it is true, yet nevertheless virtually—down to the present day. On this subject, as on almost every other connected with the religion and policy of the Israelites, we have very little ground for real knowledge beyond what we find in the Old and New Testaments, where indeed we find all that we need to know about customs that we shall never again be called on to keep. With the four men whom Paul aided to discharge their vow we have nothing to do, beyond the mode in which he acted and the motive by which he was led, as we might think, to depart from that freedom of the Gospel which he preached at a later period, but not whilst still hampered by connection with the hierarchy at Jerusalem. We may form a very good notion of the mode and also of the object which the leading brethren proposed in the following instructions, which Paul adopted:

We have four men which have a vow on them; them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave *their* heads, and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but *that* thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law. . . . . .

Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them. [xxi, 23-26.]

The readiness of Paul to close with the proposal of the leading Jews does not seem to have availed him before the common people of Jerusalem. The Jews "which were of Asia," as they are termed, stirred up the people, even before the seven days of purification were ended. This is the man, they cried out, who taught the people everywhere to disobey the law; and whereas they had seen in his company one Trophimus, an Ephesian, who had previously been with him in Greece, and was now in Jerusalem, they accused Paul of introducing him into the temple. The result might be expected.

All the city was moved, and the people ran together: and they took Paul, and drew him out of the temple: and forthwith the doors were shut. And as they were about to kill him, tidings came unto the chief captain of the band, that all the city was in an uproar. [xxi, 30-31.]

The speedy intervention of the chief captain saved Paul. That officer (Chiliarch, as he is termed in Greek—Military Tribune is the name in Roman history) fulfilled the prediction of Agabus by ordering the soldiers to bind Paul with two chains—one, we may suppose, for the feet, and one for the hands; naturally demanding at the same time who he was and what he had done. As was also likely, no clear answer was given to this question: one cried one thing, and one another. The chief captain, unable to get anything certain out of a mob, commanded that he should be carried into the castle, or Roman guard-house. But as they were mounting the steps which led into it, Paul said unto the chief captain, "May I speak unto thee?" To which the chief captain, knowing the exclusiveness of the Jews as regards the learning of languages, replied, "Canst thou speak Greek?" To this question it is to be regretted that Paul did not—perhaps had no opportunity to return a direct answer; for the chief captain continued in the same breath:

"Art thou not that Egyptian which before these days madest an uproar, and leddest out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers?" But Paul said, "I am a man *which am* a Jew of Tarsus, . . . a citizen of no mean city: and, I beseech thee, suffer me to speak unto the people." [xxi, 38-39.]

Permission being given, Paul spoke unto the people, not in the Greek, but in the Hebrew tongue.

The tenour of his speech now was no longer to conceal his departure from the laws and customs of the Jews. The various modes by which he had evaded that dangerous

topic could no longer be adopted, when he had been once shown to have taught throughout the world that those laws and customs were no longer binding, and the time was now come when he must declare himself openly; and he was not wanting to the occasion. The people were at once silent, when they heard him speak in their native tongue, and he began his address by reminding them that he had been as zealous as they in the observance of the Jewish law, and qualified his former statement of his being of Tarsus, and therefore, as some might think, an alien, by adding that he was

> Yet brought up in this city [*Jerusalem*] at the feet of Gamaliel, *and* taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day. [xxii, 3.]

After this preface, of which the object was to conciliate his hearers, he tells them the story of his persecutions towards the Christians, of his conversion, his baptism, and of his life since that time. He then alludes to his first visit to Jerusalem, when the Christian brethren were unwilling to receive him; but instead of referring to the aid which Barnabas gave him in smoothing his way to joining the society of the apostles, he speaks of a trance, in which the Lord appears to him and says: "Depart, for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles" (xxi, 21). This word roused the anger of the multitude, and they cried, "Away with such a fellow from the earth; for it is not fit that he should live." They were, indeed, on the point of stoning him on the spot, but he was again rescued by the chief captain, who gave orders to bring him into the castle, and, according to the barbarous custom of many ancient and even modern nations, examine him by scourging, "that he might know wherefore they cried so against him." From this ordeal, however, he saved himself by asking the centurion, who had charge of him, whether it was lawful to scourge a Roman citizen who was uncondemned. The centurion reported this to the chief captain, and both of them were somewhat alarmed.

> Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, "Tell me, art thou a Roman?" He said, "Yea." And the chief captain answered, "With a great sum obtained I this freedom." And Paul said, "But I was *free* born."

The chief captain, seeing the chance of his getting into

trouble for putting a Roman citizen into bonds, commanded him to be released, but gave orders that the Jewish council should be called together the next day, and that Paul should appear before them.

In this episode of Paul's life, his appearance before the chief captain, some critics have raised an objection to his claim of being a Roman citizen by right of birth. Nothing has reached us to show how far the chief captain might have paid a large sum of money for the same privilege; nor is it less difficult to show how Paul could by birth have obtained it, for Tarsus had not such right of citizenship. We must also bear in mind that the speeches given in the Acts of the Apostles, like all speeches given in historical works, cannot be shown to rest on any contemporary authority, much less on witnesses who were present when those speeches were delivered. It is asserted by Jerome, in his account of illustrious men (*De viris illustribus*), that Paul was not born at Tarsus, but at Giscala, a Jewish town of Galilee, and that he was of the tribe of Benjamin. This town was the last town in Galilee which submitted to the Romans in the Jewish war, as we learn from Josephus (B. J. II, xx, 6). Jerome adds that when the town was taken, the father and mother removed with their son to Tarsus in Cilicia. This statement must, of course, be taken for what it is worth, but it certainly has some support from the Epistle to the Romans (xi, 1), where Paul claims to be an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, and of the tribe of Benjamin. It is very doubtful whether Jews living wholly in foreign countries were so particular in recording the tribe to which they had formerly belonged: they do not do so now.

The council, which met on the morning after Paul was rescued from the mob, was perhaps the Sanhedrim, shorn, as it had been for many years, of the power which it possessed in the days of Jewish independence, and, if we may trust to the description of its conduct when Paul appeared at the bar, equally void of that dignity which alone might have retained for it some portion of its former influence. St Paul, on the other hand, with greater dignity, first asserted his innocence and his good conscience up to that very day; upon which the high priest, Ananias, commanded the bystanders to smite him on the face. This act of tyranny was severely rebuked by Paul:

God shall smite thee, thou whited wall; for sittest thou to

judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law. [~~xxiii. 8.~~] XY 3 - 3

The bystanders replied, "Revilest thou the high priest?" and Paul excused himself by words which, in the Greek, are ambiguous. Our authorized version renders it, "I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest," and the Revisionists interpret it in the same way; but it has been rendered by some, "I wist not that there was a high priest," and they have endeavoured to show that at this time there was no high priest in office. Whilst the question is very unimportant, yet St Paul might certainly be expected to know whether or not it was the high priest before whom he was standing. To suppose that he was short-sighted is unworthy of a place in a history which deals with realities only. The writer of the book justifies the bystanders in their censure of Paul by quoting the words, "Thou shall not speak evil of the ruler of thy people," which form part of Exodus, chapter xxii, verse 28. The quotation is given in the Greek of the Septuagint, but omits the words, "Thou shalt not speak evil of 'the gods,'" which might lead to a serious question about the view which the ancient Israelites entertained of the gods worshiped by their Canaanitish neighbours. The English version of Exodus avoids that difficulty by interpreting the word not gods, but judges, contrary to the interpretation which is found in the Latin Vulgate as well as in the Greek Septuagint, and suggesting that the mention of gods might be a stumbling-block even to more modern Christians.

But the question of what we might call contempt of court in Paul's conduct, was speedily turned aside by his discovery that the members of the court belonged to two different sects—the one Sadducees, the other Pharisees. How Paul was able to discover that there was such disunion among the members of the court, we are left to judge for ourselves: but he was not slow to take advantage of it in the defence which he made for himself. He was not now called on to speak before a foreign tribunal, as he had been at Athens, where, with something like disingenuousness, he had pleaded that the god whom he worshiped was one of their own gods, whose name they knew not; but he was now to defend the resurrection, and the immortality of the soul, which formed the belief held by the larger number of those before whom he had to plead. He accordingly began his speech by declaring that he was a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee;

and that the hope of resurrection of the dead was the very subject about which he was called in question. The want of dignity of his hearers was now fully manifested by the dissension and clamour which followed. The Sadducees believed neither in angel or spirit, nor in the resurrection of the dead; but the Pharisees believed in all these; and the Scribes who were on their side declared that they found no fault in Paul. "If," said they, "a spirit or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God." This was the very argument formerly used by Gamaliel, who was also a Pharisee, and who persuaded the council to set free the apostles at the beginning of their ministry; and it is not out of place to observe that the high priest, who on that occasion had arrested the apostles, was surrounded by Sadducees, who were filled with indignation, and encouraged the high priest to put them into the common prison. If, then, there was a lasting schism among the Jewish rulers at Jerusalem, as seems probable from the similar mode in which the two prevalent factions acted towards the apostles, we need not wonder at many things which occurred afterwards, or at the antagonism between the various sects which is so clearly manifested in the history of those times.

It was not unlikely that Paul would fall a victim to the rage of the mob; and the chief captain, fearing lest he should be torn in pieces, sent down the soldiers, who rescued him by force and brought him into the castle. In the night which followed that day, Paul was encouraged by the Lord in a vision, and warned that, as he had testified to the truth in Jerusalem, the time was come for him to bear testimony also at Rome. But he was not yet safe from the danger which had threatened him.

When it was day, certain of the Jews banded together, and bound themselves under a curse, saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul. And they were more than forty which had made this conspiracy. [xxiii, 12-13.]

What would surprise us most in this matter is, that the conspirators should communicate their design to the chief priests, the elders, and the council, requesting them to signify to the chief captain to bring Paul down, that they might examine him still further as to the charges brought against him, and they added that those who formed this conspiracy would kill him on the way. We shall not be wrong in believing that the Jewish authorities at this time were prejudiced against Paul, and would willingly allow the

conspirators to have their way. Nor is it unlikely that the apostles and other Christians had by this time come to an understanding with the Jewish rulers on the principle of mutual forbearance and concession in uniting Christian doctrines with Jewish forms; for we know that such an union afterwards gave signs of existence, and perhaps some of those called elders, who are named with the chief priests and the council, belonged to that intermediate class of Judaizing Christians who from this time are more hostile to the Pauline doctrines than any of the Gentiles. But it is the fate of most conspirators to be betrayed by one of their comrades, or by some servant or other adherent who has been, unwittingly or otherwise, a witness of their counsels. In the present case it was Paul's sister's son, who, in some way or other, "heard of their lying in wait," and entering into the castle, warned Paul of his danger. The young man was consequently taken by the centurion, at his uncle's request, to the chief captain, who, having heard what he had to say, charged him to let no man know it, and at once sent Paul, under the escort of two centurions, with two hundred legionary soldiers, two hundred spearmen, and seventy horsemen, to Felix, the governor at Cæsarea. The centurions bore with them a letter to Felix, from which we learn the name of the chief captain:

> CLAUDIUS LYSIAS unto the most excellent governor Felix *sendeth* reeting.
> This man was taken of the Jews, and should have been killed of them: then came I with an army, and rescued him, having understood that he was a Roman. And when I would have known the cause wherefore they accused him, I brought him forth into their council: whom I perceived to be accused of questions of their law, but to have nothing laid to his charge worthy of death or of bonds. And when it was told me how that the Jews laid wait for the man, I sent straightway to thee, and gave commandment to his accusers also to say before thee what *they had* against him. Farewell. [xxiii, 27-30.]

The centurions, with the infantry, escorted Paul only as far as Antipatris, where they rested for the night, and on the morrow returned to Jerusalem, leaving him to be conducted the rest of the way to Cæsarea by the cavalry. The governor Felix, having been told that Paul belonged to the province of Cilicia, commanded that he should be kept in Herod's judgement hall until his accusers also should be come (xxiii).

§ 9. PAUL AT CÆSAREA.

No less than five days passed before Paul could again be put upon his trial. Ananias, the high priest, and the elders then made their appearance from Jerusalem, with a man named Tertullus, an orator as he is termed, and therefore engaged, it would seem, as an advocate to conduct the case against Paul. This man, beginning with praise of Felix, under whose government the Jews were so happy, proceeded to describe the prisoner as a pestilent fellow, a mover of sedition everywhere among the Jews, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes, and how, when he profaned the temple, he had been arrested by the Jews for trial, but rescued from justice by the chief captain, Lysias. The rest of the Jews who were present testified that these things were so, and Felix beckoned to Paul to reply to what was charged against him. This, indeed, was not a hard task, for the accusation was one of the most vague and informal that could well be urged in a court of justice, and we cannot doubt that Felix, especially after the letter which he had received from Claudius Lysias, looked with a lenient eye at a prisoner against whom no political or moral crime, but only the practice of what he thought a harmless superstition, was alleged.

In the answer to his accusers Paul began, as Tertullus had done, by expressing his confidence in the judge, and then pleaded that he had neither profaned the temple nor been detected in any seditious movement or disputation either in the synagogues or in the streets, and that, in fact, only twelve days had passed since he came up to Jerusalem to worship. To this he added that he had done no more than worship God after the manner of his fathers, that he had purified himself in the temple, as others had done, without mob or tumult, that those who denied this ought to have now been present, that he had brought alms for the poor of Jerusalem, and that he was, in fact, accused of nothing more than of a belief in the resurrection of the dead, which his accusers also believed as well as he.

By this speech Felix is said to have had a "more perfect knowledge of this way"—that is, of the Christian doctrine—and he decided to hear him again when Lysias the chief captain should have come. Meanwhile a centurion was ordered to keep Paul in a sort of free custody, with permission to his friends to see and minister unto him.

We hear no more of the chief captain, but of Drusilla, a

Jewess and wife of Felix, who came with her husband, out of curiosity perhaps, to see Paul the next time that he was brought up for examination. At this meeting Paul came nearer to the real doctrine which marked his preaching—faith in Christ. Here he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgement to come, and Felix, we are told, trembled, and put off the hearing of Paul until a more convenient season. But the narrative is continued in a manner which seems to denote feelings rather at variance with trembling:

He [*Felix*] hoped also that money should have been given him of Paul, that he might loose him: wherefore he sent for him the oftener, and communed with him.

This delay of justice and uncertainty of Paul's fate continued two years, at the end of which Porcius Festus came into Felix's room, and Felix, willing to show the Jews a pleasure, left Paul bound. With the characters, the antecedents, and the subsequent career of these Roman governors and other officials, who appear in Judæa about this time, we are not otherwise concerned than as they have to deal with St Paul and with the various incidents which befal him and his companions in the course of preaching the Gospel. But it has been the custom of modern theological and ecclesiastical writers not only to introduce descriptions of person and place which throw no light upon the historical text and accuracy of our Scriptures, but to indulge their imagination in suggesting facts which drown the original narrative in a flood of words, and render the attempt to interpret the real history, scanty as it is, nugatory and ineffectual. Whatever may have been the real character of Felix, it is difficult to understand how he can have been inclined to favour Paul as a harmless enthusiast, then to have trembled at his doctrine, and at the same time to have had frequent communings with him, expecting to receive a bribe for setting him free, to keep him two years in custody, and lastly to curry favour with the Jews by handing him over bound to Porcius Festus, his successor.

The new governor spent three days at Cæsarea, and then went up to Jerusalem, where he was urged by the Jewish leaders to bring Paul back from Cæsarea, intending to lie in wait for him and kill him on the way. This, however, the governor refused to do, and having arranged that Paul's accusers should follow him, he, after about ten days, returned to the seat of government. The next day Paul was again brought before the judgement seat.

And when he was come, the Jews which came down from Jerusalem stood round about, and laid many and grievous complaints against Paul, which they could not prove. (xxv, 7.)

But Festus, like his predecessor, was not unwilling to please the Jews, and proposed that Paul should go up to Jerusalem, where an enquiry might be made concerning the things of which he might be accused. This proposal depended, we find, upon St Paul himself, and was not likely to be accepted. Loudly protesting his innocence, and denying the right of any one to deliver him up to his enemies, he appealed to Cæsar, whereupon Festus, having consulted with his council, replied, "Hast thou appealed unto Cæsar? Unto Cæsar shalt thou go" (xxv, 12). This decision was not hastily or without due cause arrived at. Felix, the predecessor of Festus, had been a long time governor of Judæa, and Paul, in his address to him, "answered the more cheerfully" from knowing, as he pleaded before him, "that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation" (xxiv, 10); and it is more than probable that Porcius Festus learnt from his predecessor Felix many facts concerning the chief prisoners who were handed over to him, and especially of St Paul.

How long time elapsed between this decision and the fulfilment of it by the dismissal of Paul to Rome, we can only infer from the absence of any other facts than the second hearing of Paul before King Agrippa, who with his sister Bernice had lately come to Cæsarea to salute the new governor, Porcius Festus. When they had been "many days" at Cæsarea, the conversation turned upon the prisoner Paul, and Festus explained to the king the very weak case which the Jews had endeavoured to establish against him, showing how they had asked Festus to give judgement against him, contrary to the Roman custom of not condemning any man unheard. The king expressed a wish to hear Paul himself, the more so probably from the short sketch of the case which Festus put before him.

When the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed: but had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and of one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. [xxv, 18-19.]

It cannot be doubted that Festus, as well as Agrippa, would feel, as the former declared, that Paul's having appealed to Cæsar was the only hindrance to his being released. But it was the wish of the prisoner himself to go

to Rome, and it was perhaps one of the few modes by which his life might be preserved from the enmity of the Jews. And it is certain that the Roman governors of all degrees were not unfavourable to St Paul and other Christian teachers who were brought before them. Both Gallio and the others were very unwilling to listen to any accusations of doctrine, not of overt acts, which were brought against them: they looked upon all such as disputes of superstition, and not of morality or of natural religion, such as were held by all the upper classes of Roman society.

We know that not many years afterwards the Roman governors in various parts of the world became very severe in their treatment of the Christians; but they had great provocation given them. Their liberal principles allowed all individuals as well as nations to follow their own codes of religion, but also to recognize those of others; whilst the Christian code imposed on its followers the destruction of every other form of religion whatever, and the absence of images and of formalities gave their heathen neighbours the belief that Christianity was atheism, and their abstinence from almost every form or ceremony required of good subjects alienated the minds of all who were attached to their old forms of religious belief. But the age of persecution had not yet begun, when Festus and Agrippa, with his sister Bernice, came with great pomp to the court, attended by the chief captains and principal men of the city, and Paul was brought before them.

The conduct of the governor Festus was without reproach. He had allowed Paul's appeal, and made up his mind to send him to Rome, but "had no certain thing to write unto my lord [the emperor]."

> Wherefore I have brought him forth before you, and specially before thee, O king Agrippa, that, after examination had, I might have somewhat to write. For it seemeth to me unreasonable to send a prisoner and not withal to signify the crimes *laid* against him. [xxv, 26-27.]

After this statement of what justice required, Paul was permitted by King Agrippa to speak for himself, and began his address in almost the same words which he had used before Felix when first brought into court. He expressed the greater satisfaction at having for his judge one who thoroughly knew the customs and the train of thought among the Jews; and if, as has been thought by some, Agrippa was himself a Jew, the satisfaction at being

under his jurisdiction would be so much the greater. But the next clause of Paul's speech is somewhat at variance with what he says elsewhere, or, at all events, with the opinion that St Paul was of Tarsus bred as well as born. He had already said to the chief captain (xxi, 39) that he was a Jew of Tarsus, and in his address to the people from the stairs leading up to the castle he says that he was born in Tarsus, yet brought up in Jerusalem, at the feet of Gamaliel. He now states as follows:

My manner of life from my youth, which was at the first among mine own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews; which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify, that after the most straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee.

It would be difficult to find a form of words in which the strict and almost exclusive nationality of Paul could be more clearly expressed, and we may assume that he foresaw that his judge would be favourably inclined to him from this avowal. He then pleads that his belief in a resurrection was no more than all the Jews entertained, and he justified his belief in Jesus by relating the circumstances of his own conversion, as we have already seen, with details differing from the relation which he had already given in his address to the people, and also from the account of it given by the author of the Acts of the Apostles. He proceeds to show that he preached, first at Damascus and then at Jerusalem, the Christian doctrine which he had previously tried to destroy. And lastly, he winds up his defence in these words:

Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that Christ should suffer, *and* that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people, and to the Gentiles. [xxvi, 22-23.]

We see that in this concluding sentence the speaker no longer uses the name of Jesus, but of Christ. It is doubtless his wish to have it understood that the Jesus whom he saw in so many visions was the same as the Christ, or the Messiah, to whom they were fond of applying the sayings of Moses and the prophets. The words which Paul used were probably spoken with the fervour which belonged to his character, but which could hardly be rendered afterwards in describing them. He was interrupted by Festus,

a Roman, and less liable to be swayed by religious fervour than King Agrippa: "Paul, thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad." Paul denied that he was mad, and appealed to Agrippa as one who believed the prophets. "I know that thou believest," said Paul; but Agrippa, no more inclined than Festus to adopt Paul's belief, evaded a direct answer by a reply which has been misinterpreted, in England at all events, for many hundred years. "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian," is the rendering of our Authorized Version, and has been the subject of many a discourse in which the power of our religion has been shown to have almost persuaded Agrippa himself to become a Christian. So general indeed is this interpretation, even at the present day, that the Revisionists, men of learning, have substituted a version which seems to favour the old interpretation and yet does not distinctly say so: "With but little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian." The original reply of Agrippa in Greek is not conditional, but direct and indicative: "In a small [way or degree] you are persuading me to become a Christian." To which Paul's reply, truly rendered, is most appropriate: "I would to God that, whether in a small or great degree, not thou only, but all that hear me this day, might become such as I am, save these bonds."* Both the king and Festus had now heard enough to convince them that their prisoner was a harmless enthusiast, who had neither done nor would do, if released, anything worthy of death or of bonds, and "might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar." (XXVI, 32.)

§ 10. THE VOYAGE TO ROME.

The career of Paul, whether in Judæa or among the Gentiles, where he had carried on his missionary labours, was now at an end. He had escaped by legal judgement from all the conspiracies that had been formed against him, and met with great success in spreading the Gospel, as he had taught it, however unlike the Judaic Christianity which had grown up in Jerusalem. That it was beginning to be unlike the form which prevailed among the people of Jerusalem may be inferred from the allusion which Paul himself makes no less than three times, "according to my gospel" (ROM.

* The error in previous versions is caused by not perceiving that to persuade in the present tense implies an attempt only, not success. You "are persuading me" has a far different meaning from "you will persuade" or "you have persuaded me." The Greek verb *peitho* and the Latin *suadeo* are subject to the same rule.

ii, 16; xvi, 25; II Tim. ii, 8), which hardly would be consistent with Christian modesty, unless he was aware that other forms of the new doctrine were less in harmony with that which he upheld and preached.

His last imprisonment had no doubt straitened Paul much, but had ended in what would have been a triumphal acquittal, if he had let the law take its course; but it is almost certain that he would not have accepted an acquittal if it had been offered. He had appealed to Cæsar, and his wish was to see Rome, and his aspiration was to evangelize that city, as he had evangelized other smaller cities of the empire. This wish could not have been gratified, perhaps, if he had been left to his own resources; but, as a prisoner, he would be sent at the public expense; and it is not likely that Paul was detained long at Cæsarea, after it was settled that he should be sent to Rome. The narrative of his voyage to Rome is told in the first person:

> When it was determined that we should sail into Italy, they delivered Paul and certain other prisoners unto *one* named Julius, a centurion of Augustus's band: and entering into a ship of Adramyttium, we launched, meaning to sail by the coasts of Asia; *one* Aristarchus, a Macedonian of Thessalonica, being with us. [xxvii, 1-2].

He who writes this must include at least himself with St Paul, if no others, by using the first person *we* in the plural number; but Aristarchus, who was with Paul at Ephesus, where, as his companion, he was, with Gaius, arrested by the mob (xix, 29), here now appears not as a prisoner, but as travelling separately. (See Farrar, ii, 365.) He is also named as Paul's companion when passing through Macedonia back into Asia, and with him several other disciples, who now are not mentioned. (See p. 348.) The omission of names, whether of these or of any other companions of Paul, is unfortunate, seeing that the author of the Book of Acts might be Luke, according to old opinion, if there were the slightest possibility of showing that he was carried prisoner with St Paul to Rome. This, however, is wholly untenable, and the only certain fact is that in certain parts of the Book of Acts the writer, by using the first person plural, *we* and *us*, professes, silently and without previous notice, to have been one of those who accompanied Paul to Rome. To assert that this unknown writer was either Silas, Timothy, or any other, whose names occur so irregularly in the only history of Paul's voyage to Rome, is only suited to the imagination

of poets or of theologians who are led to supplement the paucity of materials by conjectures flowing from the necessity of making systems. It is but reasonable to suppose that as no other than St Paul was arrested and had appealed to Rome, no other than he would be conveyed at the public expense. And yet we find it asserted that Luke and Aristarchus accompanied Paul, and were driven by stress of circumstances to remain with him during great part of his Roman imprisonment. There is not the slightest ground for saying that Luke accompanied Paul to Rome, or that being a physician, he might easily have procured a free passage.* The vessel in which they sailed touched at Sidon the day after leaving her moorings, and Julius, the captain, suffered Paul to visit his friends. Who these were we are not told; there is no record of Paul's ever having been there before; and the only notice of that city in the Acts of the Apostles is that King Herod was displeased with the conduct of its inhabitants, and pacified by their ready submission (xii, 20). From Sidon the ordinary voyage to Rome would have been in a straight line to the narrow sea between Italy and Sicily, passing to the south of Cyprus and to the north of Crete; but the wind was now contrary to such a route, and they sailed, on the north of Cyprus, to Myra, a city of Lycia, where Paul was transferred to a ship from Alexandria, which was on its way to Italy. The wind was, however, still against them, and when, after many days, they found themselves no farther on their way than Cnidos, a city of Lycia, they followed the example of the former ship and steered south, so as to be sheltered by the island of Crete from the adverse west wind. Making the best of their way along the south coast of this island, they had lost so much time that the fast of the day of Atonement, which fell on the 10th day of the 7th month, or in this year on the 24th of September, was already past, and the navigation in consequence became more difficult. They were now off the coast of Crete, at a place called Fair Havens, near which was the small town of Lasæa. It was here that St Paul foretold that the voyage would be "with hurt and much damage not only of the lading and ship, but also of our lives."

Nevertheless the centurion believed the master and the owner of the ship, more than those things which were spoken by Paul. [xxvii, 11.]

* Dr Farrar's Life and Work of St Paul, vol. ii, p. 365, note.

Soon after this the wind blew softly, and the voyage was resumed in the hope of reaching Phenice, a town further west on the coast of Crete, and of wintering there. But now came on a fierce wind, which, whether truly named Euroclydon or Euroaquilo, brought this unlucky voyage to a disastrous, though not fatal, issue. Running under cover of the little island, Clauda, they took on board their boat, which hitherto had been towed astern, and undergirding the ship with ropes or chains, in the way which since then even to modern times has often been adopted, they for three days drifted slowly westward, in great fear lest they should run upon the Syrtes quicksands. They then lightened the ship by throwing overboard whatever they were able, and looked forward to nothing but being drowned.

After long abstinence Paul stood forth in the midst of them, and said, "Sirs, ye should have hearkened unto me, and not have loosed from Crete, and to have gained this harm and loss."

He exhorts them to be of good cheer; for they shall all be saved, with the loss of the ship only; for that an angel of the God whom he served had appeared to him, using these words:—

"Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Cæsar: and, lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee." . . . Howbeit we must be cast upon a certain island. [xxvii, 24-26.]

We know not how the soldiers and crew received Paul's speech, but when they sounded and found a sudden fall from twenty to fifteen fathoms, they were afraid of running upon rocks, and cast out four anchors astern, but the sailors got out the boat in order to make their escape, pretending that they wished to cast anchors out of the foreship also. Paul, however, protested that, if these men did not abide in the ship, they could not be saved. For saying this he needed no divine warning; the sailors were wanted to manage the ship, and a boat would be of great use to assist in landing the crew. Paul now urged them to take some meat, as it was fourteen days that they had fasted—that is to say, had taken no regular meal. They did as he bade them, and became of good cheer, although there were two hundred and seventy-six persons on board. When they had eaten, they cast their cargo of wheat into the sea, and cutting away their anchors, with the help of a sail, they ran the ship aground at a place where two seas meet, and, as the prow only struck in the ground, the hinder part was broken to pieces, and those

on board, by swimming or supporting themselves on parts of the ship, came all safe to land.

§ 11. SOJOURN IN THE ISLAND OF MELITA.

The inhabitants of the island, from whom the shipwrecked company learnt that its name was Melita—the modern Malta—are called *Barbaroi* in the Greek text, which has been rendered "barbarous people" in the English version. This, however, is of ambiguous meaning: the Greeks and Romans called all other nations *barbaroi*, which by no means implies that those to whom the name was given were in our sense barbarians. The people of Melita received the shipwrecked strangers kindly, and kindled a fire, by the warmth of which they dried their clothes. Whilst Paul was aiding to gather sticks for the fire, a viper (*echidna*) fastened on his hand, and the people at once thought that it was a divine punishment on a man who was a murderer, and that he would presently fall down dead. But when Paul shook off the beast and was unharmed, they thought he was a god. It appears that at present, at all events, there is no venomous snake found in the island; to which it is replied that the destruction of the woods and the increase of inhabitants may have led to their extermination. But there is another mode of explaining the matter which may be taken into the account. The race of snakes, adders, and vipers is very various: some are very poisonous in their bite, others less so, and others not at all. Nothing is said in the text to sanction divine interference to save Paul's life: the beast which fastened on his hand may not have bitten him, or may have done so slightly and with no poison in its bite. The writer of the narrative may or may not have seen in Mark's Gospel (xvi, 18) the prophetic words ascribed to Jesus, "They shall take up serpents." As neither St Mark's Gospel nor the Acts of the Apostles appears in history until an hundred and thirty years after those words were spoken, it is impossible to say which of the two works may have contained references to the other. But more than one writer of a later age has quoted the case of Paul and the viper as illustrating the speech of Jesus contained in the last chapter of the Gospel according to St Mark.

The only other notice of St Paul whilst he was in the island of Melita refers to Publius, the chief man of the island, who owned lands near the place where the shipwrecked strangers were stopping, and who lodged them in his house three days.

It came to pass, that the father of Publius lay sick of a fever and of a bloody flux; to whom Paul entered in, and prayed, and laid his hands on him, and healed him. So when this was done, others also, which had diseases in the island, came, and were healed; who also honoured us with many honours; and when we departed, they laded *us* with such things as were necessary. [xxviii, 8-10.]

§ 12. JOURNEY TO ROME.

St Paul and his companions, not many in number—how many we are not told—but with them he who, by using the first person, has been said to have written the Book of Acts—stayed three months in the island of Melita, and then in a ship called the Diourskooi (Castor and Pollux), which had come from Alexandria and wintered in the island, passed over to Syracuse, where they spent three days.

From thence they passed to Rhegium and on to Puteoli, near Naples, where they found brethren with whom they spent seven days, and then went by land to Rome. At Appii Forum also they were much encouraged by finding brethren who came to meet them; by which title we may understand Christian converts, such as no doubt were found in many other cities of the Roman empire as early as the sixty-second year of our era, the time about which we may fix the date of St Paul's arrival.

The leniency of the Roman Government, which was always shown in the case of prisoners accused only, and perhaps not guilty, of trifling offences, was shown towards Paul.

He was allowed to dwell by himself with the soldier that kept him, but the other prisoners were delivered by the centurion to the captain of the prætorian guard.*

Three days after his arrival at Rome, Paul called the chief of the Jews together. In doing this, notwithstanding that he had more than once declared that in future he would turn to the Gentiles, he yet shows plainly his Jewish nationality, and we might be led to think that, if he had been less furious and more discreet in some of his meetings with his own countrymen, the issue might have been a better understanding than there then was, and possibly an united Christianity less formal and more spiritual than that which for centuries has existed in so large a part of the civilized world.

* The Revisionists omit this clause about the other prisoners, stating in the margin that some ancient authorities insert it. Is this sound criticism? Is it not more likely that a sentence has been accidentally left out than that it has been put in?

The communication made by Paul to those who came to meet him referred only to his innocence of any crime, and to his defence before the Romans who would have set him free, if he had not appealed to Cæsar; he concludes with saying that it was "for the hope of Israel that he was bound with this chain." But the Jews were not by this drawn away from the subject which they knew to underlie all that Paul might urge about himself. They must have known from the brethren who went to meet him what was the nature of the doctrine which he taught. They verified by their reply that the Gospel, however it might be foolishness to Greeks and other Gentiles, was, at all events, likely to be a stumbling-block to them, the Jews.

And they said unto him, "We neither received letters out of Judea concerning thee, neither any of the brethren that came showed or spake any harm of thee. But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against." And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into *his* lodging. [xxviii, 21-23.]

To those who thus came together, we are briefly told that

He expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the Prophets, from morning till evening.

Such a description of Paul's address to the assembled Jews does not convey to our minds much information of the heads which formed the subject of his discourse; we are left to infer this from what we read elsewhere of his teaching. The prominent doctrine of all the apostles was that our Lord, having risen from the dead, would return to earth during the lifetime of those who were then alive; and to this was added the belief that he would reign in Jerusalem for one thousand years. The authorities for this belief have already been given fully in a former page (136) of this work; and it cannot be denied, if we may trust to St Paul's epistles, that his own teaching was in harmony with this belief. How this might be reconciled with the doctrine of election and reprobation, and whether such a doctrine would be received by the Jews who came together to hear what he had to say on his first arrival, can hardly be thought doubtful. We are therefore prepared to read what was the result of the meeting. "Some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not." St Paul, making use of the statement which is found in all the four gospels, and

appears to be a sort of paraphrase of what is found in Isaiah (vi, 9), that God had hardened their hearts and blinded their eyes, so that what was open to their bodily senses should not find its way to their hearts, declared to them that the salvation of God was now sent unto the Gentiles, and that they would hear it. The Jews, we are told, when departing from the conference, reasoned much about it among themselves, and though we are not told what were the most important points of their reasoning, we may imagine what effect such a plain theory of election and reprobation would have upon the minds of those who had learnt from one of their poets, Ezekiel (xviii, 5-9), that "if a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right," and abstains from the evil deeds which the poet then enumerates, "he is just, and shall surely live, saith the Lord God."

The last two verses of the Acts of the Apostles contain all that we know further of St Paul, from this or any other work, for the space of more than one hundred years, or 160 years since the beginning of our era.

And Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him. [Acts, xxviii, 30-31.]

It is well known that Nero, Emperor of Rome from A.D. 54 to 68, laying a false charge against the Christians, that they had kindled and kept up the fire which destroyed so large a part of the Roman city, inflicted on those persecuted people the most cruel and outrageous tortures that could be devised. They were burnt alive, or thrown to wild beasts in the amphitheatre, without pity or remorse, in a way which brought obloquy upon the name of Nero, and created sympathy for his unhappy victims, which probably did its share in bringing him to a well-merited death about four years afterwards. The Christians at that time were becoming sufficiently numerous to attract the notice of the Government, and it is not likely that whilst other inferior members of their body were sacrificed, Paul, their leader, would be spared.

In spite, however, of the silence of the Book of Acts, and the absence of any other authentic evidence, many modern as well as ancient writers have attempted to prove that Paul was really accused and acquitted before Nero, and yet was

again arrested after two years, and then met that death which with more reason may be asserted to have befallen him at first, with those who suffered for the asserted crime of arson.

To establish the release and second imprisonment of Paul, soon after the end of the Book of Acts, not the most vague evidence can be quoted from any ancient writer, and modern writers have had recourse to the three epistles ascribed to St Paul and addressed to his two pupils, Timothy and Titus, as found among the epistles of St Paul included in the canon of the Church. As this addition to St Paul's life is most unsubstantial in all its parts, it will be safe to speak of it hereafter, in connection with a similar addition to the career of St Peter, which is alike imaginary and based upon no evidence at all of a contemporary or trustworthy character.

CHAPTER XXIX.

St Paul's Epistles.

It has been truly remarked by critical scholars of all nations that having two sources of information about St Paul and his labours in forwarding early Christianity, we may the more easily arrive at some definite conclusion on that wide and difficult subject. We have in the foregoing chapter followed the order of events related in the Acts of the Apostles, with the addition of a few comments here and there tending, it is believed, to render a more reasonable understanding of that history than generally prevails among Christian readers. But we have also epistles addressed, nine of them to the inhabitants of large cities and even states, and three to private men, who are named as having been friends and companions of St Paul, who appears and is generally acknowledged without much doubt as author of some of them. The inscriptions to these epistles here follow:

1. Epistle to the Romans, in 16 chapters.
2. First Epistle to the Corinthians, in 16 chapters.
3. Second Epistle to the Corinthians, in 13 chapters.
4. Epistle to the Galatians, in 5 chapters.
5. Epistle to the Ephesians, in 6 chapters.
6. Epistle to the Philippians, in 4 chapters.
7. Epistle to the Colossians, in 4 chapters.
8. First Epistle to the Thessalonians, in 5 chapters.
9. Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, in 3 chapters.
10. First Epistle to Timothy, in 6 chapters.
11. Second Epistle to Timothy, in 4 chapters.
12. Epistle to Titus, in 3 chapters.
13. Epistle to Philemon, in 1 chapter.
14. Epistle to the Hebrews, in 13 chapters.

Comparing this list of letters with the places at which St Paul stopped in the course of his missionary tours and other travels, we may obtain something that may guide us, not to the time when each of these letters was written, but to the time before which it is unreasonable to believe that they could have been written. It would be still more unreasonable to suppose that any of these letters were written after the end of those two years during which Paul enjoyed peace and leisure at Rome.

The first missionary tour, therefore, in company with Barnabas, must have been the earliest limit to the period in which any of these letters could have been written, and we have seen, whilst tracing the progress of the two apostles in their missionary tour, that they did not visit any of those cities and states to which any of these epistles are addressed.

In Paul's second tour in company with Silas, the two missionaries only went "throughout Phrygia and Galatia," and nothing is said of any preaching or missionary labours therein. But it was at this point of time that the dramatic incident of the man of Macedonia calling on them to pass over into Europe led to their sojourning for a time in the city of Philippi, to whose inhabitants the sixth epistle in our canon is addressed.

From Philippi St Paul and Silas went to Thessalonica, where they stayed only three or four weeks, during which time they were the victims of assault from the populace, and could hardly have been able to make friends to whom they might reasonably indite letters at some future time. The next people amongst whom Paul sojourned were the Athenians, to whom he wrote nothing, knowing probably it was in vain to attempt the conversion of so literary a

nation; but at Corinth and Ephesus, where he next appears, there were not wanting friends to whom he might afterwards address letters of friendship, reminding them of his visit.

In his third missionary tour Paul again went through Galatia, but no details of his visit are recorded; and he again visited Ephesus, from whence he came into Europe, paying a second visit to Philippi, but not apparently again to Corinth, for no notice of this has been recorded. On his way back to Asia through Macedonia, he again visited Philippi, and from thence proceeded by sea to the coast of Syria, where his missionary labours in Asia were at an end, and he was sent to Rome, where up to this time he had never been, and therefore might seem to have no friend or correspondent to whom an epistle addressed to Romans could be sent.

The names of Titus and Philemon do not occur in the Acts of the Apostles. The former is known to us only in St Paul's epistles to the Corinthians and to Timothy, and the latter only in the epistle addressed by St Paul to Philemon himself and others, on behalf of the run-away slave, Onesimus. Of these two epistles and a third addressed to the Hebrews, no external evidence of time or place can be given; they must stand or fall by such internal testimony as can be produced to ascertain the time when they were written and the place from which they were addressed.

From these facts it may be inferred that all the epistles of St Paul were written within the time that elapsed between his second missionary journey, about A.D. 50, and the end of the two years A.D. 62 or 63, which he spent at Rome before the outbreak of Nero's persecution of the Christians, to which, in all probability, Paul was the chief victim. This interval was of about ten or twelve years; and with these preliminaries, we may proceed to examine the Pauline Epistles in order, and first that which is addressed to the Romans.

§ 1. *Epistle to the Romans.*

This epistle has never appeared in any other form than as one of the writings contained in the whole volume of the New Testament, which did not become known to the world until about the 170th year of the Christian era. The three earliest MSS of the New Testament are the Vatican, the Alexandrian, and the Sinaitic. The first of these names Corinth as the place from which this epistle was addressed

to the Romans, the other two name no place; the Authorized Version has "Written from Corinth to the Romans by Phœbe, the deaconess of the Church in Cenchreæ." As this place is on Corinthian territory, it may be inferred that Corinth is the city from which this epistle was supposed to have been written. Now it was at Corinth that St Paul spent one year and six months, working with his hands for his own maintenance, and there met with Aquila and Priscilla, who had come from Italy. It was there also that Gallio declared his liberal recognition of private judgement in matters of opinion. But nothing, in the account which is given of that second tour, bears upon the question of St Paul's wish to visit Rome; and in his third tour, although he traverses Greece, which was Hellas, nothing is said of his again visiting Corinth, which was in Achaia. From this time, moreover, there is still no indication of a wish to visit Rome, on the part of Paul, until he is at Ephesus, in the course of his third missionary tour, when he sends Timotheus and Erastus in advance to Macedonia, saying that he will soon follow them and go up to Jerusalem, after which, says he, "I must see Rome" (xix, 21). It was probably the acquaintance of Aquila and Priscilla, whom he had just left at Corinth, that led him to form the intention to visit Rome. However this may be, his intention evidently grew stronger; and in the night after he was rescued by the chief captain from the disturbance which followed his appearance before the Jewish magistrates at Jerusalem, his intention was confirmed by a vision, or, which is nearly the same thing, the vision sprung from the settled determination of his own mind, in the form of words which follows:

> Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome. [Acts, xxiii, 11.]

All further deliberation was now at an end; the apostle was brought, at the end of his missionary career, before Felix and Festus, the two Roman proconsuls, and lastly before King Agrippa. It is probable that his appeal to be heard before Cæsar might have been brought about by the danger in which he stood if delivered up to his enemies at Jerusalem, as well as by his wish to see Rome and to preach the Christian doctrine before the people of that city, even without the divine communication which he received. We are unable, then, to determine when St Paul may have written this first epistle in our canon, and are driven to examine that document itself, to solve that question, and to

meet other difficult points which can only be met by such an examination of its contents.

1. It is pertinent to such an enquiry to ask on what ground it is to be accepted that St Paul, a Jew of the strictest sect, and supposed by the Roman official, when asked permission, not to be able to speak in Greek, but in Hebrew, as we have seen he *did* speak, why it is that a long letter is produced, one hundred years after his death, addressed to the Romans, and written in the Greek language, although it is well known that the common people of that city, to which class the great mass of early Christians belonged, had for many hundred years spoken Latin, as they continued still to speak it for many hundred years after that time. Nor does it alter the terms of that question if we suppose that the number of Jews in Rome was great; for it is equally true that Jews in a foreign country do their best to retain a knowledge of their native Hebrew, whilst compelled of necessity to learn the language of the country in which they reside.

That the lower classes of Roman citizens spoke Latin requires no proof; that in the Roman courts of justice and others throughout the empire, the use of the Latin language was imperative, and that Greek was a language of luxury among the upper classes at Rome, as French and German are with us at present, is equally capable of demonstration; and that the Jews in Jerusalem and throughout Judæa were more wedded to their own language and customs than any other people, may be seen conclusively in the writings of Josephus, who took many years laboriously, in middle life, to learn the Greek and to translate into that language the works which he had at first written in Hebrew. That St Paul was probably subject to the same conditions of life as Josephus, is strongly confirmed by what he says of himself in several places both of the Acts and of his own epistles.

His declaration that he was a Jew of Tarsus (see p. 356-357) is very much modified by his further statement that he was brought up at the feet of Gamaliel in Jerusalem, and was as zealous of his religion as all those whom he was addressing. In the Epistle to the Philippians he reminds them that they might fairly trust in his integrity, for he was

> Circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law a Pharisee. [PHIL. iii, 5.]

In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is a similar

declaration of his nationality, which renders it still more difficult to believe that he would address a letter to Romans in other than his own language on the one hand, Hebrew, or on the other hand in theirs, which was Latin. He is speaking of others who were not in harmony with him:

> Are they Hebrews? so *am* I. Are they Israelites? so *am* I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so *am* I. [II Cor. xi, 22.]

And in the Epistle to the Romans, which is now occupying our attention, is a similar declaration, for the frequent repetition of which it would be more difficult to account if it occurred in writings of which the author wrote not in Greek, but in Hebrew:

> I say, then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, *of* the tribe of Benjamin. [Rom. xi, 1.]

In the Epistle to the Galatians he says briefly, but quite as much to the point, that he

> Profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals [*in years*] in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers. [Gal. i, 14.]

To this may be added the fact that his sister was probably married and settled in Jerusalem; for we have seen that it was the son of this sister who detected the conspiracy to murder Paul, when he was sent down by the chief captain to Cæsarea. It will be easy to infer from the general tenour of these extracts that St Paul was a genuine Jew in sentiment, in education, and in other peculiarities which have been remarked by the classical writers as distinguishing the Hebrew nation; and it may well be doubted whether he, who was so exclusively a Jew, and showed his hostility to St Stephen, could have afterwards, when he became a Christian, been able to acquire a knowledge of Greek, which Josephus found it so hard to master, and to write so many epistles in this newly acquired language. That he learnt Greek at Tarsus is a gratuitous supposition. He may have been born there, although St Jerome denies it; he was bred up in Jerusalem, at the feet of Gamaliel, and in that city pursued his religious studies with greater success than others of his own age and nation.

2. A second reason for doubting whether St Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans arises from the extraordinary terms in which he praises his correspondents for virtues which, never having seen them, he would probably know nothing about. He thanks God that their "faith is spoken

of throughout the whole world" (i, 9). He says that he makes mention of them always in his prayers.

Making request (if by any means now at length I might have a prosperous journey by the will of God) to come unto you. For I long to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift. . . . Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (but was let hitherto). . . . So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. [i, 10-15.]

But whilst these extracts from the epistle so plainly refer to a Christian community already established at Rome, we find in the Acts of the Apostles a description of things diametrically opposite to what has just been quoted. The ignorance which the Jews at Rome professed when Paul called them together, and the whole tenour of the passages which may be seen in page 374 of this volume, show that St Paul's words in the epistle cannot well be justified, unless the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles be set aside altogether as unhistorical and untrue. This cannot readily be admitted, and it is easier to refer both documents to a later age, when the need of a written canon would not be a safeguard against errors which do not invalidate the truth of Christianity.

3. When Paul expresses his readiness to preach the Gospel to his Roman correspondents, and at the same time admits that his presence is not needed, it might be thought by some that he wished to acquire greater consideration for himself. He writes, towards the end of the letter:

I myself also am persuaded of you, my brethren, that ye also are full of goodness, filled with all knowledge, able also to admonish one another. [Rom. xv, 14.]

It would be difficult to give a reason why the presence of St Paul should be needed at Rome after reading his own admission that his place had been so well supplied by other teachers, whoever they may have been. And such, too, seems to have been the view taken by St Paul himself; his own admission shows either that he did not write the epistle, or he offends against his own rule and intrudes on what would be regarded, in ecclesiastical language, as the bishopric of another. It is said by some writers belonging to the Papal party that the previous evangelist of the Romans was St Peter, and this seems to have been the view taken in the Clementine Homilies; but we cannot believe that St Paul would have left us in the dark, if St Peter had pre-

ceded him in Rome. In such a case he would not have contented himself with the disclaimer which he now makes in the words which follow:

So have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation. [xv, 20.]

Such is the view which St Paul takes of his position, and he confirms the same by what he says in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians:

Not boasting of things without [*beyond*] *our* measure, *that is*, of other men's labours; but having hope, when your faith is increased, that we shall be enlarged by you [*magnified in you*], according to our rule abundantly, to preach the gospel in the *regions* beyond you, *and* not to boast in another man's line of things made ready to our hand. [II Cor. x, 15-16.]

These words are addressed to Corinthians, with whom Paul had spent more than eighteen months, and made the acquaintance of Aquila and Priscilla, who had lately come from Italy. If, therefore, it was from Corinth at this time that he wrote his Epistle to the Romans, it is rather inconsistent that having twice declared so strongly his wish not to trespass on the province of others, he should nevertheless have offended against this rule so signally by his ministry in Rome. The distinction of dioceses as areas of episcopal jurisdiction does not appear to have been introduced until many years afterwards, and all writings in which such separate jurisdiction is declared would not date their origin earlier than the subjects of which they treat.

A short remark which St Paul makes in the same part of the epistle, that he is going up to Jerusalem "to minister unto the saints" (xv, 25), reminds us of the notice found in the Acts of the Apostles concerning such a journey to Jerusalem. We may perhaps identify that journey, which has slightly been recorded in a previous page (350) of this work, with the one which St Paul tells us he is now on the point of undertaking. In the history of his travels we have seen that he returned from his third missionary tour through Macedonia, to avoid the plot laid against his life by the Jews. We now find in the Epistle to the Romans a further reason for taking so long a circuit on his way to Jerusalem, if at least the journeys are one and the same:

For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem.

. . . When therefore I have performed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain. [xv, 26-28.]

From this extract one clause has been omitted, as deserving to stand by itself, and indicating that the Epistle to the Romans, as well as others perhaps, was addressed rather to the Gentiles than to the Jews resident among them. Paul justifies the aid of money sent to Jerusalem, seeing that the Macedonian and Achaian converts are debtors for the benefit they have received in the Gospel, and so the exchange of carnal in return for spiritual things has from that time prevailed in the Christian Church. We have also seen what a number of adherents accompanied St Paul in this journey through Macedonia. They, no doubt, were of service in helping St Paul to collect this money, and as labourers, in all probability, participated therein as their hire.

4. But if the account given in the epistle is trustworthy, the apostle speaks of going further west into Spain (xv, 24-28). Nothing is said of this in the Acts of the Apostles, and it is not necessarily to be expected that he would speak of his intention to take so long a journey. The only thing to be wondered at is that, having never been at Rome, where he knew perhaps no one, he should speak of going to a country so remote, passing over Rome and the whole of Italy and the south coast of Gaul, as of less importance to a missionary than the distant Iberian peninsula. It has even been said that St Paul preached the Gospel in Britain; and this foolish tradition, as is the case with all such legends, in conjunction with the proposal to preach in Spain, can only have the effect of throwing great doubt over the reality of any intention to visit either Spain or Britain; and this opinion is strongly supported by the utter silence of all who lived near the time, and especially of him who wrote the last part of the Acts of the Apostles, who might have wound up his history by some further facts relating to St Paul, unless, as is probable, he was never set free at all, but was put to death by Nero with the other victims who suffered from that emperor's tyranny.

5. We proceed now to a fifth reason which might be urged against the authorship of this epistle which is generally received by Christians. It has been remarked by critics that the sixteenth and last chapter has the appearance of being an appendix to a work which would be complete without it. "Now the God of peace be with you all, Amen!" is the fitting end of the fifteenth chapter, supposed to be the last. But in the sixteenth chapter there are

three other Amens, and the chapter is full of names which occur in various other passages of the New Testament, and some of them nowhere else. It will be useful to review these names. He commends to his Roman correspondents Phœbe, who, according to the subscription, has charge of the epistle. He requests them to greet Aquila and Priscilla, who, as our version has it, "have laid down their own necks," but who in truth had not done so, or it would not be possible to greet them. The word *hupethekan* may be more correctly rendered "exposed" their own necks; but how or when they did so we are not told. We only know that they went with St Paul from Corinth to Ephesus, when he stopped on his way at Kenchrea.

If we may trust to the First Corinthians (xvi, 19), Aquila and Priscilla, with the church that is in their house, are joined with St Paul in sending salutations to the people of Corinth, leaving it to the reader to discover what facilities might exist so that this married couple might appear at places so widely distant as Rome, Ephesus, and Corinth, as related in correspondence with St Paul, and even as settled at Rome between their two appearances at Corinth and Ephesus. There are no less than thirty-two names of persons, residing, we must suppose, in Rome, to whom St Paul sends greetings as to those who were "well beloved" by him (5), "of note among the apostles, fellow prisoners," and "two of them his kinsmen" (7). Of such a strange fact no explanation has been given, and it furnishes a remarkable contrast to his silence in the other epistles ascribed to him, in which he omits to name some who had been closely connected with him in his ministry, even in the first foundation of churches planted by himself. There is, too, one named Epænetus, termed "the first-fruits of Achaia," but now living at Rome. These strange facts have been explained in different ways. The German Baur has declared the sixteenth chapter to be a spurious addition, and that so many names have been inserted in order to attach greater importance to St Paul. Dr Farrar has thought that it was addressed not to Rome, but to Ephesus. The French Renan thinks that a copy of the whole epistle was sent to Ephesus and other cities, each having a different ending—namely, those short passages to which so many Amens are now attached, all now brought together into one series. Besides this, which creates great suspicion that the epistle has been tampered with, it appears that Marcion, the early heretic, omitted in his copy the whole of the

fifteenth and sixteenth chapters, as forming no part of the genuine epistle. It is difficult to abstain from ascribing the whole of it, not to St Paul, but to the early Christian Church, consisting of Greeks, well acquainted with their own language, and engaged in compiling out of such sources as were at hand a body of writings to form the canon of the Christian community.

6. In the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans we find words which hardly could have been written by St Paul. He says he is debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians, &c. as before. The distinction between Greeks and barbarians would be intelligible in Asia and the East; but to plead that, because he was bound to preach to those distinct classes, he was ready to preach at Rome, where neither class existed, except in subordination to an overwhelming Latin population, might be appropriate at a later date, when Greek Christianity was all-powerful, but hardly fitting from the pen of St Paul. We find the name of Gentiles used elsewhere in this epistle (xi, 11), but not in connection or contrast with Greeks, as forming two classes of a whole people. From not perceiving the true nature of these passages, a controversy has arisen to determine whether the Epistle to the Romans was addressed to the Jews or to the Gentile population of the Roman city. The introduction of the foreign term Gentiles, of which the true meaning is "nations," including all, even Greeks, except the Jews, has led to many doubts about the true interpretation of certain passages.

7. In our notice of the expectation that Jesus would soon appear to establish his kingdom on earth, will be found (p. 141) Paul's exhortation to the Romans, based on the same prophetic intimation. It may well be asked, how St Paul could address them on such a topic, seeing that the Romans had certainly not received any very accurate information about either his actual ministry on earth or the belief that he would come again, of which they probably had never heard.

8. But whilst gathering such facts tending to the conclusion just stated, we must recur to a certain passage in the epistle which seems to point more strongly to the same conclusion. What is the meaning of the 22nd verse of the last chapter: "I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you in the Lord"? So plain a declaration cannot well be set aside, and it is hardly satisfactory to suppose that Tertius was merely his secretary, for he is named nowhere else.

9. It remains to call the attention of the reader to a passage already quoted (p. 143) from the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, which, whether written by St Paul or not, is of the utmost importance in determining how far the hand of St Paul may be seen in the composition and publication of what passes under his name. It would not be tolerated by Christians, and must not be suggested to their adversaries, that our canon is made up either partly or wholly of writings forged for the purpose either of pecuniary profit, or of religious deception; and yet we cannot doubt that there were current, even in St Paul's own lifetime, epistles professing to have been written by him, based upon his own belief in the Second Coming, and carrying their views so far as to demand from him the censure which he bestows upon it. Those to whom he addresses this censure are warned not to be misled by "letters as if from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand." Such letters then were forgeries, and it is not certain that some of the forged documents of that age are not still in existence in our old libraries.

That these things could have been so, will no doubt cause much surprise to those who have always regarded the apostolic age as supernatural, and wholly different from all other epochs of history whatever, but not to those who regard the apostles as men like ourselves, whose lot is thrown amid the manifold tempers and interests, whether hostile or otherwise, of the men by whom they are surrounded, and who have to maintain their position as best they can, like ourselves, among the varied storms and other incidents of human life.

There are numerous other passages in which reference is made to the share which St Paul had in writing his various epistles; some of them seem to describe penmanship as well as authorship of either composition or of doctrine. They bear more or less upon the present subject, and some of them may be given here for that reason, with less need of recurring to them, although equally or more signal will be given under the head of the other epistles to which they belong.

St Paul, in I Cor. (iv, 14), says, "I write not these things to shame you;" and in the same epistle (iv, 37) he uses the same form: "The things that I write unto you are commandments of the Lord." In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is a more striking instance of language of the same kind:

For we write none other things unto you than what you read or acknowledge, and I trust you shall acknowledge even unto the end. [i, 13.]

In ii, 9, of the same epistle he tells us: "To this end also did I write;" again, "It is superfluous for me to write unto you" (ix, 1); "Being absent now, I write to them who have sinned" (xiii, 2); "I write these things, being absent" (xiii, 10). In Galatians also (i, 20) St Paul makes oath before God, that he lies not in the things which he writes unto them; and in another part of the same (vi, 11) he speaks of the epistle towards its close in terms which have never been thoroughly explained, because never thoroughly understood, by any of the commentators:

Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand. [vi, 11.]

These words are intelligible, but they do not represent the Greek original, which must be rendered, as the Revisionists have rendered them, "See with how large letters I have written unto you with mine own hand," and so this corrected translation is more difficult to understand than the former, unless we suppose the Apostle to have given importance to his subject by writing large, as the sculptors of the Assyrians gave majesty to their kings and conquerors by representing them as many times greater in size than the ordinary sculptured warriors.

In the short Epistle to Philemon (19) Paul says he has written it with his own hand, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii, 22) says, "I have written a letter unto you in few words."

These passages mostly occur in the four epistles which have been thought by most critics to have been undoubtedly written by St Paul. But there are other passages which render it by no means clear that an editor has not put together the teaching of St Paul, to furnish a more methodical body of doctrine emanating in a less regular form from the great Apostle of the Gentiles. The learned Origen, as quoted by Eusebius (vi, 25), speaks with little hesitation of these writings:

Paul being well fitted to be a minister of the New Testament, I mean a minister not of the letter, but of the spirit, who, after spreading the gospel from Jerusalem and the country round as far as Illyricum, did not even write to all the churches to which he preached, but even to those, to whom he did write, he sent a few lines.

This statement is not in harmony with the contents of our canon, or with other passages in St Paul's Epistles which will occur to us in the brief view which will be taken of each in turn.

10. Among the authorities which bear upon the residence of St Paul at Rome, and therefore somewhat also upon the authorship of the epistle to the Romans, is Josephus, "the learned and warlike Jew." We learn from his own writings that, when he was 26 years old, in the year A.D. 63, he went to Rome by sea, and was shipwrecked on the voyage. It is worthy of remark that this (seeing how uncertain is our chronology) may have been the very year in which St Paul made the same voyage, of which we have so interesting an account in the Acts of the Apostles, and was also shipwrecked.

It has been thought by many that the account given in the Acts was written at first of the voyage and shipwreck of Josephus, and afterwards transferred to the events which happened to St Paul. For this opinion the only ground is the difference which certainly exists between the former chapters of the Acts and those in which St Paul's voyage is described. It must be frankly admitted that there is no authority for supposing that the voyage of St Paul was imitated from that of Josephus, still less for supposing that St Paul and Josephus went to Rome in the same ship, although at the same time. No account remains of the voyage of Josephus, and it is not beyond the range of probability that he who at a later date compiled the Acts of the Apostles, may have been aided in the latter part of his work by notices then remaining of the voyage and shipwreck of Josephus.

Whatever may have been the previous adventures of Josephus, it occurs forcibly to the mind of the unprejudiced reader that he was in Rome at all events for some time with St Paul. Now, if we accept the date of the epistle to the Romans as a few years earlier than the arrival of its author in Rome, it follows that Josephus arrived there when a great religious movement was going on among the Jews, in which Josephus must necessarily have taken a part. It is the opinion of some that this epistle was addressed chiefly to the Jews of that city, others refer it to Gentile correspondents; but whether so or not, even if addressed to both Jews and Gentiles, it cannot be believed that one who has told us so much about the chief priests and religious doings of his countrymen could have remained long at

Rome without knowing something about the new faith, for which the Epistle tells us the Romans had become known throughout the world. It is not easy to believe that he would have remained very long at Rome without knowing something of St Paul, whose arrival at the same time, attended with the loss of a large ship, and being also an appellant to the court of the emperor, must certainly have become widely known among both Jews and Christians. Far from finding any indication that these two eminent Jews knew anything of one another, Josephus observes total silence concerning the new sect whose fame filled the world.

11. But there were other learned men at Rome. The greatest moral philosopher of the age, the younger Seneca, was residing at Rome, when St Paul arrived in that city. It might reasonably be expected that St Paul's epistle would come to the knowledge of one whose name was so famous for literature. Seneca was put to death by orders of Nero in the year A.D. 65, but we find in all his writings only two or three slight allusions to Jewish customs, whilst the name either of Jews or Christians occurs in none of them. The want of some correspondence between St Paul and Seneca could not fail to suggest the manufacture of those fourteen letters which still exist, as having passed between the two. It is not a little surprising that Jerome, in his catalogue of illustrious men, (ch. 12) should allude to these letters without entertaining any question whether they were genuine or not. And St Augustine also, in his Epistola ad Maced., (54) speaks of "Seneca living in the times of the apostles, some of whose letters are extant addressed to Paul the Apostle." Although for a long time published among the works of Seneca, the contents of them are beneath contempt, and now justly consigned to obscurity. Being written in Latin, they were necessarily exposed to criticism, and in one of them Seneca advises Paul to be more correct in his Latin style. And this suggests that it was not thought extraordinary that one who had written so much in Greek should in these short letters have attempted composition in the Latin tongue. It is not an unreasonable inference that if Seneca was not aware of the presence of Christians, or of St Paul in Rome, his ignorance probably arose from the obscure position in which both the Christians and their teacher were then living.

11. It has been stated that the epistles of St Paul generally were quoted by no ancient author until the latter half of the second century. They are not mentioned by

Athenagoras, Barnabas, Hermas, Hegesippus, Justin Martyr, Papias, Tatian, or any other writer earlier than Irenæus, about the year 170 of the Christian era. Whilst asserting this of all the epistles, it becomes strong evidence against the early origin of the Epistle to the Romans, regarding it as an original work of the Apostle, although no one has doubted that it contains all the doctrine of that apostle, and forms an important part of the Christian canon. May not this be thought a more satisfactory solution of a long disputed subject than the persistent assertion of an earlier origin, subject nevertheless to interpolation and tampering in its various parts, as may be inferred from the following extract out of the work of a pious and popular commentator?

Critics have not been so well agreed as to the integrity of the present epistle. The last two chapters have been rejected by some; by others, parts of these chapters. Marcion rejected them, but on doctrinal, not on critical grounds. Heumann imagined ch. xii—xv to be a later written epistle, and ch. xvi to be a conclusion to ch. xi. Semler views ch. xv as a private memorandum, not addressed to the Romans, but written to be communicated by the bearers of the epistle to those whom they visited on the way, and ch. xvi as a register of persons to be saluted on the way, &c. [FARRAR'S *Life and Work of Paul*, ii, 32.]

The general remarks here made on this the first of the epistles ascribed to Paul may, perhaps, be found to apply occasionally to the epistles which remain.

§ 2. First Epistle to the Corinthians.

The address and the subscription, as they occur in our authorized version, here follow:

ADDRESS.—Paul, called *to be* an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Sosthenes *our* brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called *to be* saints, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours.

SUBSCRIPTION.—The first *epistle* to the Corinthians was written from Philippi by Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus, and Timotheus.

It is not without surprise that we read of Sosthenes, described as our brother, being associated with St Paul in the authorship of this epistle. He has already been presented to our notice as ruler of the synagogue at Corinth, and as

having been beaten by the Greeks, who were offended that Gallio refused to hear their complaint against the apostles. That the mob of the city, honoured here with the name of Greeks, joined both Jews and Christians in the same accusation as subverters of the law, cannot be doubted; for Sosthenes was then ruler of the synagogue, and now is Paul's dear brother at Philippi, from which town he joins with Paul in writing this letter to his former fellow citizens of Corinth. Nor is the difficulty lessened by the words of the subscription, which gives the names of four other companions of St Paul, of whom Timothy alone is known elsewhere than in this epistle; of the other three St Paul says at the end of it, "I am glad of the coming of Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus" (xvi, 15); and in the first chapter he tells us that the household of Stephanas, with Crispus and Gaius, were the only persons whom he baptized during his residence in Corinth. And this, too, he says, was done designedly, lest it should be said that he baptized in his own name.

I. This question of baptism has had no trifling origin, and has led to serious disputes between the various sects of Christians. We read in Romans (vi, 3) that baptism into Jesus Christ meant "baptism into his death;" and we find in this First Epistle to the Corinthians that the Israelites were all "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The sense of these passages cannot be otherwise than figurative; and we know that baptism was practised, not figuratively, but really, by many nations, even the Jews, before it became a Christian ordinance. But what can St Paul mean when, as we read in this very epistle (xv, 29), he asks, "Why are they baptized for the dead?" In seeking for some mystical meaning for these words, none of our critics and commentators have condescended to acknowledge its literal and obvious sense. It is notorious that the Emperor Constantine deferred his own baptism until the last days of his life, and his object was to secure the seal, which baptism was supposed to be, after all his sins and sinful pleasures had been forgiven in a lump, so that he might surely be admitted to the kingdom of heaven. If, then, this seal was so certain in its effect, might not a living man be baptized as a representative of one who was dead, and who perhaps was prevented by death from being baptized himself? We have, indeed, heard of instances in which a dead man has received in his own insensible person the rite which, having been from some cause omitted, was still thought powerful to save.

2. It is in this First Epistle to the Corinthians that the mention of baptism is most prominent, and it is in the same writing that schisms show themselves among the converts, and it may be suspected that baptism had something to do with these schisms. That Cephas, who is generally admitted to be Peter, was adverse to Paul is evident from several authorities, but that Apollos was another leader of a sect can only be explained from his having been a follower of the doctrines of John the Baptist—a thoroughly Jewish, and only a momentary Christian teacher.

The Apostle beseeches the Corinthians to be of one mind, to "speak the same thing," and "that there be no divisions among them;" for he adds that he has heard, through them which are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among them. That these contentions arose from that theological jealousy which ever since has divided and embittered the intercourse of Christian sects, can scarcely be doubted. St Paul himself, whilst he deprecates, acknowledges its existence:

Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul? [i, 12-13.]

The probability that Apollos, of whom we know only that he was originally of the school of John the Baptist, was really set up as an opponent, is not lessened by the recurrence of his name in the second chapter of this epistle (4-8), where St Paul asks, with some little acrimony, "Who is Apollos?" and suggests that whilst himself planted and Apollos watered, yet it was God who gave the increase. Religious teachers are often careful to claim whatever respect or other advantages their ministrations may be thought to entitle them to.

3. Such questions as these, and many others, would be thought more appropriate when it had become more common that serious dissensions should arise and leaders be appointed, or should appoint themselves, to lead the various sects. It is not, indeed, to be denied that opinions were sometimes conflicting even in the first years of Paul's ministry, but whenever they arose, the difference of language spoken by the Corinthians could not fail to aggravate quarrels and create dissension among the people of the city, and this difference of language gives importance to the question why St Paul should address epistles in the Greek language to a Latin colony. It is well known to

those who read history that the Roman general Mummius wholly destroyed Corinth in the wars by which the Romans finally gained undisputed sovereignty, and that the site of the city remained desolate for many years. The place was devoted to the gods, according to a Roman custom mentioned by Macrobius (SAT. iii, 9), until about the year 40 B.C., when Julius Cæsar sent a Latin colony to restore it from its ruins, and from that time Latin was the prevailing language of the city, and the place itself was called COLONIA JULIA CORINTHUS. "No one," says Pausanias, "of the ancient Corinthians inhabits Corinth, but only colonists sent by the Romans;" and this has received the most thorough confirmation from the testimony of modern travellers. Dr Clarke speaks of caves hewn in the rock near the sea, having within them recesses intended to receive cinerary urns according to the Roman, but not the Grecian, mode of sepulture. To this must be added that all the coins struck at Corinth, from Julius Cæsar to Elagabalus, of which there are 340 distinct types, except three or four, have inscriptions in the Latin language.

4. More important than quarrels for pre-eminence among the teachers of Christianity would be those which arose from the Eucharistic ceremonies—if, at least, it be correct to apply the term eucharist at so early a date. This, however, is not so clear; for even in the gospels there is a divergency of statement which has made it difficult to determine when the agapæ—or love-feasts, as they are called by some—were developed into the Holy Communion ceremonial, to which so much sacredness ever since has been attached. In neither of the Gospels according to Matthew and Mark does Jesus command his disciples to celebrate any communion service at all. He offers them the cup, that they might drink, and bread, that they might eat; but he does not say, "Do this in remembrance of me;" nor does he add the words, "as oft as ye shall drink it." He only says, "Take, eat; this is my body," and "This is my blood of the new testament [*covenant*], which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (MATT. xxvi, 26). In the Gospel according to St John not only is there no offer of bread and wine, no command to eat or drink in remembrance of their Lord, not only is there no hint of any ceremonial at all, but nothing said of preparation for any other than an ordinary supper. We are therefore thrown back upon the Gospel according to St Luke for all that we know about that which now forms the most solemn

ceremonial of most Christian churches. Here, however, we still meet with details which require to be examined.

In the third Gospel Jesus says of the bread, as he gives it to them, "This is my body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me." And he says of the cup, "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you;" he does not add, "This do in remembrance of me" (Luke, xxii, 19-20). These words were said, Luke tells us, "after supper," whereas Matthew and Mark say that it was done "as they were eating." The inference from a comparison of these passages would be that Matthew, Mark, and still more John, do not point to any future ceremony, but only to the last valedictory supper at which he would be present with them.

It is in the First Epistle to the Corinthians that we find a much longer description of the Last Supper. St Paul writes to the Corinthians:

> For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the *same* night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake *it* and said, "Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me." After the same manner also *he took* the cup, when he had supped, saying, "This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, *as oft as ye drink it*, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. [I Cor. xi, 23-26.]

It would be in vain to deny that this description is an expansion of that which is given us in St Luke's gospel, which also in its turn is expanded from the more simple form, as it occurs in St Matthew and St Mark. It is also important to observe that the Greek words used are the same in the third gospel and in the epistle; by which a question is suggested, which of the two is earlier in date, and which of them is copied more or less from the other? It, perhaps, is not difficult to reply that as St Paul is said to have written to the Corinthians from Philippi, and that Luke only appears in company with St Paul some years afterwards at Rome, the epistle is entitled to precedence in point of time. But if this be so, it may surely be asked why St Luke should have recorded the shorter description of the two, and also have omitted from it the twice repeated sentence, that they were to "eat and drink in remembrance of their Lord," not only on the occasion which was then present, but also "as oft as they should drink it in the

future;" and why has he omitted to record the motive which should weigh with them, that by doing so they would "show the Lord's death until he should come"?

It appears that we have four different versions of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion, each more ample than the preceding, and developed, perhaps, from ancient sources discovered from time to time, or proceeding from the requirements of the Church as it gradually enlarged its primitive and more simple ritual. According to this view, it would result that the epistle, as it now reads, is of later date than St Paul, and was circulated by the Church at the time when it is first noticed, embodying, as may well be allowed, such sentiments and doctrines as always have been known to be those of the famed apostle.

The view here stated is much supported by the numerous other passages in which the more modern form of the Holy Communion is plainly to be traced:

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? [I Cor. x, 16.]

Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils. [x, 21.]

It would be difficult to describe in any other words the religious ceremonies of Christendom which prevailed more than an hundred and fifty years after the death of Paul, when the Christians had become a powerful sect in the Roman empire, possessing temples and religious ordinances not very different from those which at present are kept up and respected in every Christian country.

5. Among the incidents which are related in the Acts of the Apostles and more briefly mentioned in the Epistles, is the appearance of Jesus to his disciples and others after he arose from the tomb. The account which is given in the First Epistle to the Corinthians can, with difficulty, be fitted in with the narratives of the four gospels. St Paul writes as follows on this subject, and says that it was communicated to him—evidently meaning by revelation:—

I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures; and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that, he was seen of James; then

of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time. [I Cor. xv, 3-8.]

These verses describe six appearances of Jesus, which do not harmonize with those recorded in the four gospels; and the difference arises from the different points of view under which the whole subject presents itself. In the gospel narrative it is apparently the intention of the writers to throw obscurity over the person of our Lord, and they represent him as appearing mysteriously to the disciples themselves, who did not at first know him: this fact has, indeed, led cavillers to object altogether to the truth of the history. But the writer of the account just quoted from the epistle, whether St Paul himself or the writer who personates St Paul in a later age, does his best to represent the appearances of Jesus as public as possible, especially when he describes him as having been seen by five hundred brethren at once, of which no trace is elsewhere to be found. The climax, also, is completed by the assertion that he was seen last of all by St Paul himself; namely, on the road to Damascus, when he was so suddenly and miraculously converted. Many critics have tried to reconcile the Acts and the Epistles on this and other points of difference, but they have generally risen into the transcendental, ignoring the more humble mode which reason and common sense supply.

6. In other passages of the Epistles, as, for instance, in chapter viii, 1, Paul defies any one to deny that he has seen Jesus. And perhaps his firm conviction of that fact may have led him to believe, as did all the apostles, in the Second Coming of our Lord. In allusion to this event he had declared to the Romans that "their salvation was now nearer than when they [*first*] believed" (Rom. xiii, 12), and in the present epistle to the Corinthians he speaks of his correspondents as men "upon whom the ends of the world are come" (x, 10). That he regarded this coming of Jesus as denoting the end of the world is shown in the extracts which have already been made in a former chapter (xi) of this volume, where the Second Coming and the Millennium have been discussed in a separate chapter. The application of those extracts is obvious. St Paul, in some parts of his epistles, teaches his disciples to prepare for the event as about to happen in their own lifetime, and elsewhere he checks their impatience and suggests delay in the same way as St Peter answers cavillers, by telling them that a thousand years are no more than one day in the sight of God. But it may be asked whether in the few years of

Paul's teaching there was time for cavillers to have arisen. The whole duration of his ministry was short enough to establish a belief in the Second Coming; but when fifty or an hundred years had passed, there might arise men who were dissatisfied that the prediction was unfulfilled, and who asked what sign there was that the Second Coming would take place at all?

7. It was during Paul's second missionary tour, with Silas, that he first went to Philippi, and from thence in due course visited Corinth, where he spent eighteen months. In his third missionary tour he again visited Philippi, and we suppose it was there that he wrote his First Epistle to the Corinthians. But he never again visited that city, and we are rather surprised to find subjects discussed in his epistle which appear to have little connection with his correspondents, but rather to be more appropriate in a cyclical letter addressed to the whole body of Christians. Some of these subjects, indeed, savour of a later date, as, for instance, the Gnosticism which spread rather widely in the second century, and had hardly had time even to initiate itself in the few years of St Paul's career.

The first Christian who is described as a Gnostic was Cerinthus: after him occur the well-known names of Montanus, Valentinus, Marcion, and many others. Their theory is expressed by the Greek word *gnōsis* (knowledge), and the best idea that can now be formed of its meaning is that it indicated religious speculation, whereby many of the early Christian teachers professed a kind of occult philosophy, formed out of Eastern, Jewish, Platonic, and other elements, based upon Christianity, and carefully entwined and amalgamated with some of its doctrines, resulting generally in allegorical interpretations. Among other fancies, they imagined the God of the Jews to have been a demiurgus, a mere creator, and even the creator of evil, whereas there was another god above him, the author of all spiritual good.

A second conception among the Gnostics was the theory of Æons, a word which, transferred from its chronological idea of Ages, became personified ideas, types of the finite world, presenting us, as the German Baur expresses it, with an antithesis of the ideal and the real, as also of the upper and the lower world. When this doctrine represented Christ himself as an Æon, and the number 30 occurring in the gospels as indicating the number of Æons, we cannot wonder that the Gnostics, and all their adherents,

were stamped as heretics by those who maintained orthodoxy in the Christian Church.

This slight sketch of Gnosticism is here introduced because some have thought that such a kind of religious speculation is to be traced in this First Epistle to the Corinthians, where St Paul says:

> For to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge [*logos gnōseōs*] by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit. [I Cor. xii, 8.]

The same liberal views seem to prevail where Paul suggests that a man who has knowledge [*gnōsis*], and who ventures to eat meat offered to idols, may embolden others to act with greater freedom than the Jewish bigotry demanded under such circumstances (viii, 10).

8. In the fourteenth chapter of this epistle we find a sort of dissertation on what is generally called the "unknown tongues." It has already been explained in the tenth chapter of this work that the word unknown does not occur in the original Greek, but has been supplied conjecturally by our translators, as necessary, in their opinion, to give some meaning to what they evidently did not otherwise understand. The reader is referred to that chapter as containing all the information that can be obtained on this very obscure subject. But we may recur to it here to ask the question why St Paul should occupy so large a portion of his letter by writing on the supernatural gifts which are enumerated in the chapter before us. He thanks God that he speaks with tongues more than all of them (xiv, 18). And yet he would rather they should prophesy, although he would wish that they might all speak with tongues. From the awful mode in which his conversion was brought about, and the spiritual energy with which he preaches Christ crucified, the reader of these chapters can hardly look on such useless gifts as ejaculations in words that had no meaning until some Christian brother interpreted them, and a practice of private prophesying from which no benefit could accrue, without reflecting that these gifts, however termed spiritual, belong rather to the next generation, when many other absurd practices were introduced into the Christian worship, unknown, whilst the original apostles still bore in memory the beautiful moral teaching of their master.

9. It has been stated (p. 283) in our examination of the life and epistle ascribed to James, here supposed to be the

son of Alpheus, that a Greek hexameter verse occurs in that epistle, and that whilst its Greek style is by no means rude and barbarous, it is far better than any of the apostles, unlearned men, could be supposed to write. That a Greek hexameter verse should have found its way into such a composition would in itself be thought somewhat unlikely. But the same phenomenon appears in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and it is equally true that the style of all St Paul's epistle is much worse than that of all the other parts of the New Testament. In the fifteenth chapter of his First Epistle to the Corinthians (*v.* 33) we have the homely proverb, "Evil communications corrupt good manners." In the Greek it is as follows, written in italic instead of Greek letters, that it may be more easy to be read by those who are not classical scholars :

Phtheirousin ēthē chresth' homiliai kakai.

This line is introduced into the context without any mark of quotation, and if the case were otherwise, we might suppose that the writer of the epistle did not know it was a verse. Still he must have known that he copied it from some book or other, and it does actually occur in Menander. One more verse can be detected in the epistles of St Paul :

Krētes aei pseustai, kaka theria, gasteres argai (Tit. i, 12).

This is from Epimenides, and in other parts of the New Testament some fragments of verses may be traced. First we have the line already given under St James :

Pasa dosis agathē kai pan dorēma teleion.

We next have a fragment of a verse, given in the Acts (xvii, 28), *Tou gar kai genos esmen,* and spoken on the Areopagus by St Paul, who quotes it as said by "certain of your poets." It occurs in the Greek poem of Aratus, called the *Diosemeia,* a work by no means likely to have been read by a Jewish youth brought up at the feet of Gamaliel.

In the third place we find in the Acts (ix, 5, and xxvi, 14) the words *sklēron* [*de*] *soi pros kentra laktizein,* "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks." *Pros kentra laktizein.* The obvious figure of speech certainly occurs in two of the Greek dramatists, perhaps in others also.

Fourthly, it is extremely probable that the first line of the parable of the sower, given in Luke's Gospel (viii, 5), is taken from some poet ; for it falls as it stands into the form of a hexameter verse—

Exēlth' ho speirōn tou speirai ton sporon hautou.

Nor is it a bold suggestion, on the part of the late Mr. E. Greswell, that the Greek original of the words, "No one having drunk old wine, straightway desireth new," may also have formed part of an iambic poem. He suggests that the verse is formed thus:

Piōn palaion eutheōs thelei neon,

and that *oudeis* and *oinon* found a place in either the preceding verse, or that which followed this one.

These quotations, here brought together that the force of them may be better seen, are not likely to have proceeded from any Hebrew, but most probably from Greek writers, able to quote where they intended to do so, and also liable, perhaps unwittingly, to let their sentences run in bits of verse familiar to themselves and others.

10. We have seen in the former chapters of this book that it is the frequent duty of the critic to bring down to a lower date events and writings to which has been ascribed an antiquity which has sometimes raised them to the level of romance. Among others of this class might be reckoned the description of what God is said to have done at so early a period of Christianity as that when Paul lived, if we bear in mind that the Church of which he speaks appears to be wholly of his own creation, cut off entirely from the exclusive body of Judaic Christians at Jerusalem:

> God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. [I Cor. xii, 28.]

That these several officers form a kind of church government shows a later date than that of Paul, who travels too much over the wide extent of his teaching to allow an organization; and as we do not find any mention of bishops, priests, and deacons in his four principal epistles, we might infer that the church government was for a long time arranged in divers manners before it assumed the form under which Judaic and not Pauline teaching eventually brought it.

11. At the end of this epistle occur salutations from Aquila and Priscilla with the church that is in their house. It would be interesting to know of how many members such a church, limited to a household, would consist; as also how it is that Aquila and Priscilla appear at various times to have their dwelling at places so far apart from one another. The words also in which St Paul salutes them in

his own person, "The salutation of me, Paul, with mine own hand," are analogous to what is similarly written in other epistles, and bear upon the question how far penmanship is distinct from authorship in all of them.

§ 3. SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

ADDRESS.—Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timothy our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia: Grace be to you and peace, &c.

SUBSCRIPTION.—The Second Epistle to the Corinthians was written from Philippi, *a city* of Macedonia, by Titus and Lucas.

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, in agreement with the First, shows how St Paul valued the Church of Corinth as his own creation. There is found in it the same sudden change from one subject to another, and at the same time many complaints of the troubles which he had encountered —first in Asia (i, 8), then in Macedonia (vii, 5), where he was comforted by the coming of Titus, who, indeed, like Timothy, appears in various passages of St Paul's Epistles, whilst he is not mentioned even by name in the Book of the Acts. It is indeed difficult to piece together the various allusions to his journeyings, especially to Macedonia, or to explain the reasons why he spoke of going again to Corinth a second and even a third time, whereas it is pretty certain that he never went there again at all.

It is also difficult to understand certain allusions to a third letter, and especially to some one who had done a wrong, and to another who had suffered it:

Though I wrote unto you, I *did it* not for his cause that had done the wrong, nor for his cause that suffered wrong, but that our care for you in the sight of God might appear unto you. Therefore we were comforted in your comfort: yea, and exceedingly the more joyed we for the joy of Titus, because his spirit was refreshed by you all. [II COR. vii, 12, 13.]

The obscurity which hangs over this part of the letter cannot, of course, be removed without some further information on the subject of the wrong which had been done; but the very obscurity, as elsewhere, here also, has led to conjectures which, instead of clearing up the subject, have rendered it still more obscure than it was before.

It will be more to our purpose to examine some parts of

the epistle in which the hand of Paul might appear less certain from the marks of authorship better suited to the next generation.

1. In the eleventh chapter of this Second Epistle (*v.* 32, 33) is a short sentence descriptive of the adventure in the life of Paul, which has been much noticed by commentators and readers generally—his escape by night from Damascus at the beginning of his ministry. He now in this epistle, after speaking of his infirmities, in which he gloried, adds these words :

> In Damascus the governor under Aretas the king kept the city of the Damascenes with a garrison, desirous to apprehend me: and through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall, and escaped his hands. [xi, 32-33.]

Nothing is said of Aretas in the Acts of the Apostles (ix, 22, &c.), where Saul, just fresh from his conversion and remaining at Damascus, is said to have preached with much success the Gospel which not long before he had persecuted. It is the Jews who take counsel to kill him, and watch the gates of the city to prevent his escape, and it is the brethren who lower him down the walls in a basket, as appears in the Acts, and as agrees very well with the notice in the epistle. But the short narrative, which St Paul is supposed to write, is wholly unsupported by history. There is no mention of Aretas, King of Petra, ever having occupied Damascus, which was a city belonging to the Romans, who would not have allowed it to remain long in the hands of a foreign king, even if it had been momentarily seized by him. But it could not very easily have been seized by him, seeing that the whole of Judæa lies between Damascus and the dominions of Aretas, King of Petra.

The passage of the epistle in which this notice occurs does not cohere well with either what goes before or what follows. It is a fragment introduced among other accounts, and savours of the simplicity of the early Christians to magnify every incident of their past annals into political importance, and presents great difficulty of interpretation, if supposed to be written by St Paul, who would probably know well that the persecution against him had nothing of political importance whatever.

2. In both of the epistles to the Corinthians we find words which show that there was great enmity between St Paul and certain adversaries who entertained different ideas of Christian truth, and opposed St Paul, in the same way

as in modern times the strife between professors of peace and good-will assumes the appearance of hostility hardly less fierce than that which divides the various actors in the outward world. The strife between the sects which followed Paul, and those which followed Apollos, and those who professed to belong to Christ alone, has been already described. But in these two epistles the Apostle shows what he himself has to encounter from his spiritual foes. In the First Epistle his words are more general, although plain enough to show some of the points on which their opposition turned:

> Every one of you [*he says*] hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. [I Cor. xiv, 26.]
>
> Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? [xv, 12.]

But it is in the Second Epistle that the strife between the parties is more patent, and it turns less upon the doctrines which divided Paul from his adversaries than upon the authority which Paul had for assuming the name and office of an apostle. We have nothing handed down to us from these enemies, but are left to infer what was the nature of their attacks from the style in which he replies to them. He writes:

> Though I should boast somewhat more of our authority, which the Lord hath given us for edification, and not for your destruction, I should not be ashamed: that I may not seem as if I would terrify you by letters. For *his* letters, say they, *are* weighty and powerful; but *his* bodily presence *is* weak, and *his* speech contemptible. [II Cor. x, 8-10.]

He says, in reply, that he "was not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles," and that "although he was rude in speech, yet he was not so in knowledge" (xi, 5-6); and that he had "laboured more abundantly than they all" (I Cor. xv, 10); and his repeated assertions that he had seen Jesus, and received from him his apostolical commission, point to what we can hardly wonder at, that he was taunted by the Judaic faction at Jerusalem as not possessing the same authority which belonged to the original disciples of Jesus, and, indeed, could not be considered an apostle at all.

3. These disputes would be less difficult to understand if they were not set forth in letters mixed up with many

other subjects, and sent by their writer from a long distance, and after a long time had elapsed since he had been at Corinth, where, indeed, he had only once been, although in the First Epistle he promised to come to them shortly, if God willed, and asked them if he should come with a rod, or in love, and in the spirit of meekness (I Cor. iv, 19-21). He now, in his Second Epistle (i, 23), declares that it was to spare them that he came not as yet to Corinth.

From this last remark, and from his reference still to his letters, we may infer that he never again visited the city in which he had once spent a year and six months (p. 342). In some passages of these letters he speaks of testing their obedience, and, indeed, we find the same hint of spiritual authority which manifested itself more fully in the next generation than would seem to be in harmony with the small beginnings of the early Christian missionaries. An instance of this spiritual authority is the use of the names bishop and deacon, which hardly had become official names in the time and in the Christian fraternities founded by St Paul.

4. From the concluding verse of this epistle we cannot reasonably extract any other inference than that the Christian doctrine of a Trinity is plainly indicated:

> The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, *be* with you all. Amen. [xiii, 14.]

And yet it is generally acknowledged that the indication of such a doctrine, as found in Scripture, has been based wholly upon the rejected text of the three heavenly witnesses; and that, outside of the Scripture, we find no earlier sign of the Trinity than the words of Athenagoras, who in his apology for Christianity writes thus:

> We distinguish between God and matter and their different essences. For we acknowledge God and the Son his Word, with the Holy Ghost, one as to their power, the Father, the Son and the Spirit; the Son to be the mind, the word and the wisdom of the Father, and the Spirit to proceed as light does from fire.

We need not be surprised that some commentators dispute the truth of the subscription which refers the composition of the epistle to Philippi, seeing that they find it difficult to obtain a chronological order of events from such premises. But it is equally difficult to find any other place

than Philippi from which such a chronological order may be traced.

§ 4. EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

This epistle is addressed as follows:

Paul, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the dead;) and all the brethren which are with me, unto the churches of Galatia.

At the end of it, in our authorized version, is the subscription, "To the Galatians, written from Rome." In the revised version this subscription is omitted, for what reason is not stated. The Vatican, which is one of the three oldest MSS, has the words, *Egrafē apo Romēs*, "Written from Rome;" and the reason why this useful appendix to an epistle should be omitted may be not far to seek. St Paul twice passed through Galatia, as may be seen by reference to pages 26-27 of this volume.* His intercourse with the people of that country is the slightest that can well be imagined, and these visits, if they may so be called, occurred ten years or more before he settled finally for the space of two years at Rome. It has then been thought that this interval is too long for St Paul to have neglected a people to whom he writes in the forcible language which we read in this epistle; and the inference, based upon such ground only, is that the epistle must have been written between the first and second journeys, when St Paul may have stopped longer than is indicated in the Acts of the Apostles. In this case, we must believe that the words "written from Rome" are an erroneous addition to the epistle, although the quiet interval of two years in that city might be deemed to furnish great facility for all the epistles of St Paul to be written, seeing that in the Acts of the Apostles there is not the slightest sign of any having been written by him at all. This omission is not favourable to those who, at all risks, are determined to find something by which any gaps in the historical or doctrinal tenour of our canonical books may be filled up.

2. But there is no greater uncertainty about the place from which this epistle was dated than about the persons to whom it was sent, and the question which arises on the

* The First Epistle of Peter is addressed to the Galatians and other provinces of Asia.

time, as well as on the place of writing, is one which does not require the aid of professional criticism to answer. Galatia was a large province in the middle of Asia Minor, between Pontus and Phrygia. It contained many thousand square miles, and several cities, three of which were of great size—Pessinus, Ancyra, and Tavium. It is not known through what part of this country Paul went; the narrative in the Acts, as we have seen, simply states, in describing both his second and third tours, that he went through the region of Galatia, but mentions no single act that he did there, and no one person that he saw. To whom, then, did he address the letter which is so full of censure against them for having departed from his teaching? He moreover speaks of "all the brethren which are with me," as joining with him to send this epistle to the Galatians. His only companions on his first tour were Barnabas and Mark, who deserted them on the way; and they did not pass through Galatia. The only one who accompanied him on his second journey was Silas, but at Lystra he met with a disciple called Timotheus or Timothy, confirming churches (xv, 41), whom Paul circumcised, and, as it would appear, took with him as an additional companion on his tour. It is on the latter part of this journey, when Paul was preparing to pass from Troas into Macedonia, that the writer of the Acts uses the first personal pronoun *we* and *us*, as before mentioned. But some critics have based upon this usage the theory that Silas, who certainly was in Paul's company, has a fair claim to be considered as author of the Book of the Acts. This sets aside the authorship of Luke, who has the concurrent testimony of ages, however ill founded, in his favour, and it hands over to Silas, who is clearly a later convert and not an apostle, the authorship of the third gospel also.

3. Besides the difficulty of ascertaining the time or the place where this epistle was written, we find ourselves much at a loss to determine to whom it was sent, or by whose agency. It is not easy to imagine who in a large province like Galatia, three hundred miles long, could have received this bold letter from St Paul, and that it should have lain dormant more than an hundred years before it was produced with other writings for the use of the Christian Church. That St Paul should write to the Galatians at all hardly flows from antecedents such as we might expect.

We may well deplore [says a popular writer* on this very sub-

* Dr. Farrar's Life and Work of St Paul (i, 465).

ject] St Luke's non-acquaintance with the details of that visit to Galatia, which were deeply interesting and important, and of which we are now left to discover the incidents by piecing the fragmentary notices and allusions of the epistle.

4. And a more cogent argument against the ascription of the Greek epistle addressed to a whole nation is the fact that the Galatians had a language of their own. They were, in fact, Gauls from the West of Europe, the survivors of those hordes who overran Italy and Greece, and who finally settled in Asia Minor, where they named a whole province after their old country. Jerome tells us, in the preface to his Commentary on the Galatians, that in his time they retained their old Gallic language, as he had heard it spoken at Treves, where he resided in Gaul. This being so, an epistle addressed to Galatians in the time of St Paul must indicate native Galatians, the general body of inhabitants, and not the scanty number of the Greek upper classes resident among them.

We have nothing whatever in the Acts of the Apostles from which to deduce a single one of the details which modern writers would piece together so as to form a chain of real history.

The statue of the Emperor Augustus at Tavium, the well-known monument erected at Ancyra, and bearing the name of that city, and the black sacred stone which fell from heaven at Pessinus, furnish a subject of much interest to the antiquary, and may have been seen by St Paul if he ever went to those cities, but furnish no aid towards establishing the truth of any fact which might have been known about St Paul, if any such had been recorded in an authentic account of his doings in these or any other cities of Galatia.

Thus once more we may reckon among the difficulties which we have to get over in reviewing the epistles of St Paul, the use of the Greek language, which certainly was not that which was familiar to him from his birth, and, as far as our accounts go, was never acquired by him sufficiently to enable him to write these epistles. In that which we are now reviewing, addressed to the Galatians, occurs a remarkable sentence, to which it is difficult to attach any other meaning than that St Paul was either unable or unused to write at all. "Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with mine own hand" (vi, 11), is the erroneous translation given in our authorized version. It is more accurately rendered by the Revisionists, "See with how large letters I have written unto you." It is not easy

to understand the exact meaning of either version. The authorized version fails in matter of fact; for the Epistle to the Galatians is the shortest of all the four, whose genuineness has been most confidently maintained. The revised translation seems to indicate that the writer used letters of a larger size than usual with his own hand. As regards St Paul generally as a writer, Eusebius, living 250 years later, although allowing briefly all the fourteen epistles of Paul as publicly known and certain [*prodēloi kai safeis*], quotes from Origen that he "did not address epistles to all the churches where he preached, and even to those to whom he did write he sent only a few lines" (*E. H.* vi, 25). Nor is this the only shape in which Eusebius describes the Pauline epistles. Having shown how the apostles neglected the graces of style, he speaks more particularly of St Paul:

> Paul, indeed, who was the most powerful of all in the preparation of his words, and the most able in his thoughts, has not handed down in writing more than the very shortest epistles, although he had numberless things of a mysterious nature to tell of, seeing that he had attained to the contemplation even of the third heaven, snatched up to the divine paradise itself, and thought worthy to hear there unutterable words. [*E. H.* iii, 24.]

If these extracts from Eusebius have any meaning, they hardly furnish authority for the Pauline epistles in the form they now bear, and they speak of matters which are indeed mysterious, and, as St Paul himself says, unspeakable, not lawful for a man to utter (II Cor. xii, 4).

But the question how far St Paul was able to write in Greek is wholly distinct from that which suggests whether he is actually the writer of those epistles. To answer this question, his early life and education seems to supply information, slight indeed, but yet not to be passed over without minute inquiry. Nor can we assert that the most minute investigation is able to bring the question to a safe and certain solution. The divergency between the narrative of the Acts and the statements which we find in the epistles, especially in that which is addressed to the Galatians, can only be removed by the rejection of one or the other, as sources on which full reliance cannot be placed. There are certain points, however, which are not discordant, and it is not to be inferred that the Book of the Acts is other than a document sound in the main, as other histories mostly are, and only open to criticism on the many wonderful things which it records, or on details which by lapse of time may have been forgotten.

Having already traced in the foregoing pages the career of Paul as related in the historical work, we will now turn to other matters which cannot fail to be of interest in the case of so famous an apostle; and although his own biographical utterances, not a few, are found in the epistles, and especially in that to the Galatians, yet there are other sources from which valuable information, however scanty, may be gained, and, as we have now reviewed the four principal epistles, we may defer for the moment to the opinion which pronounces them at least to be genuine, and insert in this place what may be gathered from them and other sources touching the personal and other characteristics of St Paul.

Personal, Moral, and other Features of St Paul.

It has always been interesting to know something of the personal appearance as well as characteristic features of men who have been eminent in any of those walks of life which have been trodden by the varying feet of mankind. One only description from the most ancient source has come down to us, and that in brief and unflattering terms, of the appearance which St Paul presented to those who heard him. The writer, as generally believed, is Lucian, who was born at Samosata, on the Euphrates, and practised as a rhetorician at Antioch, where, perhaps, he passed a great part of his life. The date of Lucian's birth is not known. He lived at least until the year A.D. 165, when Peregrinus, the impostor, whose life he has sketched in one of his Dialogues, gained lasting notoriety by burning himself at the Olympic games. The birth of Lucian, therefore, may have been about A.D. 120, or even about 100, if, like other literary men who have written much, he lived to an age more likely to allow a larger amount of writing than generally is wrought by the pen of one man. As an inhabitant of the city of Antioch, he knew more than most men about the Christians, and he tells us that Peregrinus, about the middle of the second century, joined their society and distinguished himself by taking the place of a leader amongst them. Lucian tells us things which not only have not been contradicted, but which bear a kind of probability about them, from the fact that some of our canonical books and many apocryphal ones are thought to have been written

about the time of Lucian and Peregrinus. Lucian tells us that this impostor

Explained and cleared up some of the books of the Christians, and wrote many himself; and they deemed him a god, made use of him as a legislator, and enrolled him as their patron. They still worship that great man, who was crucified in Palestine, because he introduced this new worship into life.

This short extract is sufficient to show that Lucian had an accurate knowledge of Christianity and its origin. It is not necessary to trace here the career of Peregrinus,* however interesting it may be. There are other Dialogues of Lucian in which the Christians are named, connected, we are surprised to read, with Atheists and Epicureans, for which the only reason that can be given was that they had no images in their places of worship like the Greeks and other nations round them.

It is in a dialogue between two friends, Critias and Triephon, too long for insertion, that St Paul is introduced; but it may be stated that Critias is called on to take an oath, and the dialogue ensues as follows:

Critias: By whom shall I swear?

Triephon: By the God who rules aloft, great, immortal, heavenly, Son of the Father, Spirit proceeding from the Father; One out of Three, and Three out of One; these consider as Jove; look on him as God.

Critias: You are teaching me arithmetic; and the oath is arithmetical. You are arithmeticizing, like Nicomachus the Gerasenian. For I know not what you say, one-three, and three-one. Do you allude to the tetrad of Pythagoras, or the ogdoad, or the triakad?

Triephon: Say nothing of those earthly matters, that should be for ever buried in silence: we have not now to follow the traces of spiders. I will teach you all, and who was the earliest of all, and what is the system of the universe. For I was once what you are now; but when the Galilæan [*St Paul*] lighted upon me, that bald-headed, long-nosed man, who trod the air into the third heaven, and became acquainted with such beautiful things, and renewed us with water, he guided me into the footsteps of the blessed, and rescued us from the wicked places, and I will make you also a man in reality, if you will only listen to me.

Critias: Tell me, then, most learned Triephon, for I am quite alarmed.

---

* See Christian Records, chap. x, page 82, for both these subjects.

TRIEPHON: You have read the poems of Aristophanes the dramatist [called] the "Birds"?

CRITIAS: Certainly.

TRIEPHON: Something of this kind was written by him: "There was at first Chaos, and Night and black Erebus, and wide Tartarus; but earth, nor air, nor heaven existed."

CRITIAS: You say well; what was there, then?

TRIEPHON: There was light imperishable, invisible, incomprehensible, which dispels the darkness and which did away with this [chaotic] deformity, by the word alone spoken by him, as he who was slow of tongue has left it in writing. He fixed the earth on the waters, spread out the heaven, formed the fixed stars, and arranged their course; which stars you worship as gods. He adorned the earth with flowers, and brought mankind into being out of things which were not. And he is now in heaven, looking on the just and the unjust, and writes in a book their deeds, and will recompense all men on the day which he has appointed.

We have here a sort of parody on the account of the creation given in the Pentateuch, but assimilated in some degree to the pagan system of the universe. We have also, what is more to the point at present, a short description of some Jewish or Christian teacher, in whom it is impossible not to recognize St Paul. Nor is the picture without support from other sources, although not so disparaging as is implied in the words of Dr Farrar, who describes him "as a small and ugly Jew." Nor do we gain much from the French writer, Renan, who thinks him as ugly as Socrates, and as clever in argument and in repartee.

Between the time of St Paul's life and the end of the nineteenth century we do not expect to find more authentic records of Paul than we do of Peter and of the other apostles. There are, however, a few antique relics, varying much in date, which agree with the description given by Lucian, and as such deserve to be named, even if the Lucian who wrote that description was not the famous philosopher of Samosata, but another who lived 100 years later, and was, as Gesner thinks, the writer of the Dialogue. The earliest of the relics is a medal preserved in the Vatican at Rome, and having been found in the cemetery of Domitilla, is supposed to be as early as the latter half of the second century. He is there depicted as bald, bearded, with a wrinkled forehead and marked profile. There is next an ivory diptych of the fourth century, of which there is a facsimile in the British Museum, representing the apostle as short, bald, and with a long beard. The descriptions which

Nicephorus, John of Antioch, and others, later by several centuries than the foregoing, have given, are not worthy to be mentioned.

2. Next to the personal appearance of St Paul, we may devote a few lines to the consideration of his place of birth, seeing that there is not perfect agreement on that as on other points of his history. It is no less important a writer than St Jerome who impugns the common opinion that he was born at Tarsus. The account which Jerome gives is certainly more probable and more in harmony with the repeated declaration of St Paul that he was a thorough Jew. The words of Jerome here follow:

> He was of the tribe of Benjamin and of Gischala, a town of Judæa, and when it was taken by the Romans, he emigrated with his parents to Tarsus, in Cilicia. [Hier. *De Viris Illus.* 5.]

It cannot be supposed that Jerome, who knew so much of the Jews from his residence in their country, would hastily have recorded such a tradition, although it is evidently an error to date the time of Paul's emigrating to Tarsus from the capture of Gischalis by the Romans, which did not happen till after Paul's death. But the tradition being probable in the main, has only one counter-statement against it in the Acts of the Apostles. St Paul describes himself, in only one passage, as "born in Tarsus" (xxii, 3), and he immediately adds, "yet brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel." It is hardly possible to reconcile the two traditions, one of which is of the time of Jerome, the other not of the time of Paul, but of the time when the Book of the Acts of the Apostles was written.

3. The physical constitution of so important a man as St Paul cannot fail to be of interest, as are many peculiarities which may have had their effect in qualifying the course of teaching and of conduct which he pursued. Of his physical constitution a strange estimate might be formed if limited to the account which he gives of himself: "Who is weak, and I am not weak?" and yet he says, "When I am weak, then am I strong;" and "There was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure." In other passages he glories in his infirmities, but no details of his sufferings have come down to us, by which we may determine whether his sufferings were of the body or of the mind. It would be no great stretch of the imagination to ascribe to Paul at various times somewhat of that mental perturbation which has

shown itself in many others who have been engaged in propagating opinions and doctrines professedly, and no doubt partly, conceived to confer benefit on mankind. It certainly has been thought that the thorn in the flesh denotes some bodily malady, which has even been decided by bolder commentators to have been some kind of ophthalmia; but for this, as for many other fancies, not a single trace of evidence has been found. The thorn in the flesh was, it seems, the "messenger of Satan," and whatever might be its scientific name, we find that neither it nor any other of his numerous infirmities disabled him from enduring sufferings from which the strongest men would shrink, under which the strongest men might perish. He speaks of ministers of Christ, and says that he speaks as a fool:

I am more; in labours more abundant; in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent; in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods; once was I stoned; thrice I suffered shipwreck; a night and a day have I been in the deep. . . . . Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches. [II Cor. xi, 23-28.]

It is, indeed, difficult to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion about the bodily health and strength of St Paul's constitution. His labours, as related in the Acts, are well known, and in his epistles he refers to them repeatedly. In the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he speaks of the things which concern mine infirmities (xi, 30); he glories in nothing but in his infirmities (xii, 9); and, thirdly, he actually takes pleasure in those infirmities (xii, 10). Such words as these seem to be highly overdrawn; but such have been his reputation and influence that he has been accounted a man who, with every disadvantage of bodily health, has achieved a work surpassing that of every other mortal man.

4. The doctrine, also, which Paul preached was of the greatest service in extending his influence and ensuring success to his preaching. The oriental nations have from the most remote antiquity held the doctrine of predestination or fatalism. In a less degree, perhaps, the Greeks entertained the same doctrine. There is a dialogue in one of the Greek tragedies [*Prometheus*] where the final arbiters of things are said to be

"The three-formed Fates and the mindful Furies [*Erinnyes*]."
"Is aught then fated for Jove, besides always to reign?"
"This thou canst never learn; and do not persist in asking."

The wisdom of the Greek poet was practically that of all his

nation. Free-will and fate bore divided sway amongst them. Nor were things much different among the early Israelites, who seem to have regulated their actions by the same rule of common sense and expediency as has always prevailed among the European nations. In the case of great national calamities, where the will of both the nation and of individuals was extinct, Destiny is summoned to destroy Pharaoh, their oppressor, and to explain their fate of being delivered into the hands of their Assyrian conquerors.

St Paul alone has raised a lasting fame upon this most abstruse question of metaphysics. His persuasion that Jesus would come again seemed to follow from his conviction that he had seen him on the road to Damascus. His temporizing, at first with regard to circumcision, as shown in his treatment of Timothy and Titus, might be forgiven him, amid the difficulties which he had to encounter from the Jews, seeing that he afterwards made it almost an essential mark of difference between the old school of Jerusalem doctors and those whom he had converted out of the various nations that he had visited. Both these questions of the second coming and of circumcision were trivial compared with his third great doctrine—predestination unto everlasting life. On this twofold point he laid great stress. He deduced the resurrection of man from the resurrection of Jesus; and perhaps had greater difficulty in establishing the simple doctrine of the resurrection to everlasting life than to confirm the doctrine of fatality or predestination simply. The latter doctrine has always been received in the East; utterly unable to trace the designs and apparently conflicting dispensations of Providence, they flee for refuge to a principle of fate, and the action of this principle has been patent to all the world. It remained, however, for St Paul to introduce this principle into the religion of individuals. He insists on the resurrection, but to some it will be a resurrection to everlasting death. Hear St Paul's own words under the fable of the potter's vessel:

> Who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, "Why hast thou made me thus?" Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour? What if God, willing to show his wrath and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction? [Rom. ix, 20-22.]

The doctrine of election and reprobation has, in spite of its inherent injustice, been admitted into the tenets of some

modern churches, to the subversion, as others have thought, of all morality and virtue.

5. EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

ADDRESS.—Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, to the saints which are in Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus.

SUBSCRIPTION.—Written from Rome unto the Ephesians by Tychicus.

In many ancient manuscripts of this epistle, notably the Sinaitic and Vatican, the oldest existing copies, the words "which are in Ephesus" are left out, and the address is therefore to the saints and to the faithful in Christ Jesus. This is the reading of Tertullian, Marcion, Jerome, and, later still, of St Basil. In some other MSS the address is to the Laodiceans; and we should not be surprised at greater variations than this in so many short epistles handed down through so many hundred years. But there are questions relating to these variations of reading which cannot be passed without notice.

1. Whether the epistle is addressed to the Ephesians or generally to the saints and faithful in Jesus Christ, cannot make any essential difference, seeing that almost all of St Paul's writings have the appearance of being circular documents for the use of all the Christian churches, although framed as the work of one whose fame was established, and who appears to be writing on his own behalf to bodies of men or churches with whom, during his preaching, he had been intimate.

2. But the doubt whether the epistle was addressed to the Ephesians or to the Laodiceans, would probably have led to discussions between these churches if it was published during the life of St Paul; but if it became known to the world, as was the case, more than an hundred years after the time of St Paul, it would furnish another instance of the uncertainty which has always attended on most of St Paul's epistles. As, however, the name of Laodicea does not occur in the Epistle to the Ephesians, but occurs in Colossians with some bearing upon the question before us, the consideration of this subject may be deferred until we come to the Epistle to the Colossians, in which the mention of Laodicea is most significant, and a supposed connection

between these epistles has led to the extreme conclusion that neither of the two is a genuine product of St Paul.

No aid on this subject is found in the Book of the Revelation, where Ephesus and Laodicea both occur in the list of the seven churches to whose angels John is instructed to write. In the message to the angel of Ephesus we find this censure:

I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate. [Rev. ii, 4, 6.]

To the angel of Laodicea he writes:

I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. [Rev. iii, 15-16.]

It may be remarked, not as furnishing any decisive mark of time or place, that St Paul writes at the end of this letter that his work is to preach the mystery of the Gospel, for which he is "an ambassador in bonds" (vi, 20). This seems to point to a residence in Rome, where such was known to be his state. But if, as Mr. Lewis suggests in his voluminous Life of Paul, the words, "Awake thou that sleepest," &c. (v, 14) formed part of a Christian hymn, it would go far to bring the epistle down to a later date, when we should be more likely to find Christian hymns in vogue.

6. EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

Address.—Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.

Subscription.—It was written to the Philippians from Rome by Epaphroditus.

1. The Epistle to the Philippians suggests the same difficulty which is felt in ascribing to St Paul, a Jew, a Greek work addressed to the people of a city who spoke the Latin language. This may fairly be inferred from facts which are related by the writer (Rev. J. W. B[lakesley], B.D.) of an article in Dr Smith's Dictionary of the Bible:

The Philippi which St Paul visited, the site of which has been described above, was a Roman colony founded by Augustus, and the remains which strew the ground are no doubt derived from

that city. The establishment of Philip of Macedonia was probably not exactly on the same site; for it is described by Appian as being on a hill, and it may, perhaps, be looked for upon the elevation near the second cemetery.

Philippi is thus, as regards the language of the people, a Latin colony, similar to Corinth; and this probability, if nothing more, is confirmed by the action of the Romans, who always endeavoured to establish Latin colonies wherever they could, so as to blend the subject nations into some degree of unity with the reigning race.

This epistle, if we may trust the subscription, was written from Rome, and it is in harmony with this fact that St Paul speaks of his being "in bonds" (i, 7), and he adds that those bonds are "manifest in all the palace." On this has been based the belief of Christianity having found patronage even in the court of the emperor. But the word rendered "palace" in our authorized version, the *Prætorium*, denotes the barracks of the Prætorian guard, and has nothing to do with the palace of the emperor; nor is it remarkable that the soldiers of that guard who held St Paul in charge should know well and tell their comrades of the bonds and sufferings of the prisoner whom they guarded. At the end of the epistle, indeed, the writer sends salutations from all the saints, and chiefly those who are of Cæsar's household; but this may apply to any persons, of however humble origin, who are employed in any service of the Roman emperor.

2. In the address prefixed to this epistle the bishops and deacons are included. It is evident that presbyters, being in fact bishops under another name, are not mentioned. But it may be asked whether such an hierarchy, or form of church government, could have been established so early, and, if so, how it would be correct to speak of more than one bishop in a city like Philippi, which certainly was not a first-rate city of the Roman empire. It might, no doubt, add much to the grandeur and importance of the Christian community to speak of bishops and deacons in the plural number, but is it not a mark of a later age to speak of them in Paul's lifetime at all? Is it not likely, from the unceasing energy which St Paul displayed, and his devotion to the one object of preaching the Gospel, that he treated with much indifference such a classification of his assistant preachers as would yet be adopted to give them cohesion and dignity in the next generation?

3. It is not without meaning also that in this epistle, as elsewhere, the writer speaks of certain who, like himself, preach the Gospel, but do it out of contention and strife, whilst others did so from love of him, and zeal to forward the common Gospel. This practice of censuring a class of teachers who opposed him in doctrine, and were probably men of Judaic tendencies, has seemed to some critics to indicate an authorship distinct from St Paul, as if the real writer thought it necessary to insert a topic which might confirm the belief of readers that the letter was a genuine product of the apostle. It is true that this epistle contains more subjects than any other crowded together in so small a compass, and most of them exceedingly difficult to understand. There is also great abruptness even in pursuing the same subject, and great severity towards the rival preachers, whoever they may have been, expressed in words which we should hardly expect Paul to have used. In the passage which shows the greatest abruptness and also the greatest harshness, I must alter the translation given in our authorized version, and refer for my authority to another extract, in which the same topic is obscurely handled, as indeed it ought to be:

Look at those dogs! look at those evil doers! look at their cutting [*excision*]! [PHIL. iii, 2.]

The cutting, *katatomē*, to which allusion is here made, gains no meaning from the supposed English equivalent *concision*, but evidently expresses a more serious operation than that which *peritome*, circumcision, denotes. There is, however, a passage in Galatians which probably has some bearing on this subject, and here also not only must the rendering of the authorized version be given up, but the revised translation, which departs but little from it, is less significant of a meaning suited to the subject than that which is found in the margin of the Revisionists, and which, deviating widely from the reading of the text, is supported by the American rendering which is found at the end of the revised volume. In the authorized version St Paul wishes those who trouble the Philippians to be cut off.

The revised version makes him wish that they would even "cut themselves off;" but in the margin that they "would mutilate themselves;" and the American version makes him wish that they would "go beyond circumcision."

The subject of circumcision derives the respect with which it is treated among the Western nations from the

position which was assigned to it in the ancient nation of the Israelites. That it was practised by the Egyptians, from whom the Israelites derived it, and by other nations, was deemed no disqualification for its retention among the religious reminiscences of the Christians, although, if liturgies were again subjected to revision, it might probably be thought more agreeable to the English people that it should reverently be consigned to past history, and no longer brought before the notice of Christians, to many of whom it is repulsive.

According to the primitive habits of the Israelites, eunuchism was unlawful, but the kings afterwards introduced that and every other abomination of Oriental courts. We are at a loss, from brevity of statement, to understand our Lord's view of the matter. It has generally been admitted, however, that Melito and Origen followed the words of Jesus by making themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake.

But the total excision which the word *katatomē* implies, and the word *apokopsonto* closely expresses, is still practised among the Turks as the process of eunuchism, and perhaps was as common in the East as the minor kind of mutilation which generally suggests itself among the Western nations when the subject of eunuchs is mentioned. But it is not agreeable to English readers to find St Paul wishing to attach to his opponents any such penalty, partaking, not only of undue severity, but also indicating sentiments more allied to the harshness and bigotry which the leaders of Christianity are known to have practised in the second century.

4. To the foregoing reasons for reconsidering the question of the authorship of the Epistle to the Philippians, several others are adduced by the German critic, Baur, which would be less intelligible to the ordinary English reader. It is, indeed, open to any one to compare its language with parts of the II Corinthians, from which it might have been copied; and it is open to any one to observe that no specific object seems to have been in view for which such an epistle was desirable. We may also see that St Paul is magnified throughout its whole course, and events of his career have been recapitulated which were probably known at the time to every Christian.

But it is the opinion of the critic before mentioned that the Epistle to the Philippians has the same traits of

Gnosticism which are found in the epistles to Ephesus and to Colossæ. The relations existing between the Son, the Word, the heavenly, the earthly, and subterranean regions, with many other metaphysical terms found in these epistles, indicate the aspirations after knowledge of a later age, but are less effective in a work which studies matters of fact, and bases all its conclusions on nothing else but fact.

7. EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

ADDRESS.—Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, and Timotheus *our* brother, to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse: Grace be unto you, and peace, from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

SUBSCRIPTION.—Written from Rome to the Colossians by Tychicus and Onesimus.

The authorship of the Epistle to the Colossians, as already pointed out of that to the Ephesians, has only of late years been disputed; but the doubt raised against both has of late been more widely entertained, since there has arisen less hesitation on the part of all reasonable believers to examine into the origin, the authorship, and the true meaning of Scriptures in which they have hitherto fully and unhesitatingly believed. The first result of this late inquiry has been to join the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians in a class distinct from the others ascribed to St Paul. It may, indeed, be said that all the epistles (except Romans, I Corinthians, II Corinthians, and Galatians) are treated by commentators as of secondary value to the four just named, and by critics been considered as of doubtful authorship and of questionable authenticity.

But the Epistle to the Ephesians, being subject to two various readings—one omitting the name of Ephesians, and the other substituting Laodiceans as the people to whom it was addressed—has, of course, less claim to be exempted from criticism on that account.

It is nowhere recorded that St Paul ever was at Laodicea, which is indeed named in no other epistle than in this to the Colossians. It is here, however, named in a peculiar manner. The writer of the epistle says:

> When this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the *epistle* from Laodicea. . . . . The salutation by the hand of me, Paul. [iv, 16-18.]

We have here a reference to a letter written at the same time from Laodicea, but to whom, or by whom, written is not stated. No reference is made, however, to any epistle to the Ephesians, and the whole subject is so imperfect that no result can in any way be arrived at. Nor is any aid supplied by the anxiety which Paul feels for the Laodiceans and others whom he had never visited (ii, 1). Setting aside, therefore, all mention of Laodicea, we find, on comparing Colossians with Ephesians, so many traits of likeness, almost of identity, between the two as can hardly fail to suggest that they are not independent one of the other. The subject matter is essentially the same in both, remarkably so in the instructions given to parents, children, husbands, wives, and almost every other relation of social life. But the similarity of subject does not imply similarity of style, or that the epistles are of equal length. The Ephesians is the longest of the two, and bears to the Colossians the proportion of eleven to seven. It has, therefore, been debated by critics which of the two has served as a model for the other. The style of Ephesians is more flowing, that of Colossians more concise and grave, standing, in fact, either as a later summary of its companion, or as a first draft in the shape of notes from which the other epistle was afterwards expanded. It is thought, not without reason, that the letters have been constructed on a common basis by him who wrote in the name of Paul, and who intentionally gave a different existence to each by such variations as we find between the two.

The remarks here made about the strong likeness do not invalidate the force of what the writer of Ephesians says in the early part of the letter, and which is too important to be omitted in any discussion about the authorship of such adornment. We have chosen to join the two epistles under one head of review, because the similarity between the two is great, and the same arguments apply to both. The passage referred to runs as follows :

> Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers, &c. [Eph. i, 15-16.]

It is a great stretch of credulity to believe that St Paul, who had lived so long at Ephesus, and known the Ephesians so well, could have spoken thus about their Christian faith, as if they were strangers recently known to him from others.

The verses (17 to 23) which follow this avowal in the Ephesians deviate from the subject into one of the forms of Gnosticism which runs through both these epistles, and compel us to bring down the writings in which they occur to a later date of early Christianity. It must not, of course, be understood that Gnosticism was of one school only. The names of heretics were legion in the second century of our era, but their names have lost all their former significance; each teacher of new modes differed in some particular only from his fellow, and all carried their speculations into abstruse and absurd tenets, which caused much difficulty to the orthodox, and much subject to writers of all ages since that time for raising the crudest notions of an ignorant age to a level with the most pure code of morality that has yet appeared among men. It is impossible within the limits of this volume to dilate further on the absurd rhapsodies that were put forward under the plea of advancing human knowledge. One such identity of thought may be seen in Ephesians (iii, 10) compared with Colossians (i, 16-17). The first passage runs in these words:

To make all *men* see what *is* the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly *places* might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God. [Eph. iii, 9-10.]

The similar thoughts from the Colossians will be seen from the words which express them:

For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether *they be* thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist. [Col. i, 16-17.]

8. FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

Address.—Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians *which is* in God the Father and *in* the Lord Jesus Christ.

Subscription.—The first *epistle* to the Thessalonians was written from Athens.

It is not without suspicion of error that not only Timotheus, whom Paul had circumcised a very few years before, but Silvanus, who everywhere else is an adherent of St Peter, should join with St Paul in inditing this First Epistle to the Thessalonians, and, as is thought by most English commentators, the first of all the remaining epistles of St Paul. It is equally improbable, unless other information, now lost to us, would have altered the circumstances of the case, that St Paul should have written to the Thessalonians at all.

It appears from the Acts (chap. xvii), as extracted in page 337 of this volume, that St Paul, in his second missionary tour with Silas, spent three weeks preaching the Gospel in Thessalonica; that he not only met with limited success, but was only saved from the mob by being sent by his friends to Berœa, whose people were more noble than those in Thessalonica. Here, however, he was not safe, and was again saved by being escorted to the sea-coast, where, leaving Silas and Timotheus behind with orders to join him as soon as convenient, he took ship for Athens. The date in the margin of our Bibles for Paul's escape from Thessalonica, and his arrival at Athens, is A.D. 53; but we now find from the date given in the margin that the First Epistle to the Thessalonians was written from Athens, in the year 54, only one year, and perhaps less, after he had received such harsh treatment from those to whom he now writes. It is, therefore, with great surprise that we read the language which St Paul addresses to his correspondents. One single instance is enough to show that he who had been persecuted so recently in Thessalonica could not with truth have written to them thus so soon afterwards:

> Ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost: so that ye were ensamples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia. [I THESS. i, 6-7.]

In order to evade this conclusion, it should be shown that the Thessalonians had reversed their position towards St Paul, and that the epistle may have been written at a later date. Of the former alternative we have no evidence. St Paul never revisited Thessalonica, and the substitution of Corinth, to which he went from Athens, as the place from which he might have addressed these letters, is wholly insufficient to reconcile such manifest want of agreement between the letters and the history

2. Among the various topics, all as well suited to other churches as to that of the Thessalonians, we notice the minute description given of the second coming of our Lord (iv, 16). The mode of his coming, as already quoted in page 142, is minutely described, and in reading it the question again suggests itself how such an awful picture could be presented to a people who, at the end of three weeks, had rejected the Gospel as preached by St Paul, almost wholly. It is obvious to remark, and has been remarked, that the age of St Paul swarmed with magicians, conjurors, and wonder-workers. It is within the bounds of probability that the early Christian missionaries were looked upon as such, and their ministry rejected sometimes from the first as hostile to the public good, and if the numerous visions and trances to which St Paul was liable became known to the people amongst whom he moved, we cannot wonder that many like Lucian, who writes about him, would class him among those who were led away by their imagination, if not by a more criminal guidance.

But it is mostly in the two epistles to the Thessalonians that we have such vivid descriptions of the second coming. Those which occur in the other epistles of St Paul are much more subdued, and deal less in details. We cannot, however, abstain from the reflection that these passages are of little value for those who have even but a slight tincture of modern scientific knowledge. As long as the earth was regarded as a flat surface, and the heaven was conceived as a solid firmament, in which the stars were fixed, and beneath which the planets moved as in grooved courses, it was possible to imagine that the inhabitants of the earth, if drawn up from it, might converge to a focus in the upper air; but when the earth is known to be spherical, when it is perceived that the idea of a solid firmament is a delusion, and that height and depth, in reference to the stars or the earth, are purely relative terms, it becomes impossible to view the descent of our Lord, or the ascent of men to meet him, as other than a mark of the ignorance which prevailed in those days, and from which we could wish it to be proved that St Paul, who received so many revelations from the Lord, was free.

9. SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

ADDRESS. — Paul, and Silvanus, and Timotheus, unto the church of the Thessalonians in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

SUBSCRIPTION.—The second *epistle* to the Thessalonians was written from Athens.

The form under which this second epistle, addressed to the same correspondents, the Thessalonians, appears, is in every particular the same which meets us in the first epistle. This, however, is not what we might have expected. But here again the commentators ignore the name of Athens as the place from which the letter is sent, and by conjecture substitute the name of Corinth, the city to which Paul went after leaving Athens, and where he spent eighteen months at least (ACTS, xviii, 11). For thus dealing with the subject there is not the slightest authority, and we fall back the more forcibly on the question why, even if St Paul should have addressed a letter at all to the Thessalonians, he should now, at so short an interval, have written to them a second time.

2. Nor are there wanting grounds for expressing a doubt respecting the authorship of the second epistle. The second coming of Jesus is here again spoken of, but it is spoken of in very different terms from those in which the doctrine is elsewhere put forward. The extract from II Cor., given in page 143 of this volume, conveys no encouragement to dwell on a belief which is everywhere else proposed to the acceptance of the faithful. It is evidently apologetic. The general body of believers had been told that Jesus would come shortly, even in their own lifetimes, and St Paul not only encouraged the belief, but added the details which have been already noticed. Nor can we assent to the interpretation with which Bishop Wordsworth, and Bengel before him, have endeavoured to weaken the force and meaning which naturally attach to the account which St Paul applies to those who shall be alive when Jesus should appear. He twice uses the words, "We which are alive and remain shall be caught up," &c. Wherefore he tells his readers to "comfort one another with these words" (I THESS. iv, 18). It would hardly be a source of comfort to those who were looking forward to an almost immediate union with their Saviour to be told that a thousand years were only as one day in the sight of God, and that the "we" of whom St Paul spoke was as applicable to those who should be alive

at the end of so many years as they had always thought it was to themselves. Those who believed that Jesus would come again whilst they were themselves alive must have been endued with a faith going far beyond what men in general display.

3. The Apostle complains in this second letter of the disorderly conduct of some among them who would not work, and he contrasts his own conduct with theirs:

> We behaved not ourselves disorderly among you; neither did we eat any man's bread for naught; but wrought with labour and travail night and day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you. [II Thess. iii, 7-8.]

This boast of having by his own labour refrained from throwing a burden on his hosts, would be more forcible if his visit at Thessalonica had been three months or a year; but, as he was only there three weeks, and had enough to do to protect himself from the mob, it looks more as if some later author or editor had issued these epistles, on the belief, no doubt, that his doctrine and facts were on a Pauline basis.

10. First Epistle to Timothy.

The address and the subscription to this epistle in our authorized version are as follows:

> Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ, *which is* our hope; unto Timothy, *my* own son in the faith: Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God our Father and Jesus Christ our Lord.
>
> The first to Timothy was written from Laodicea, which is the chiefest city of Phrygia Pacatiana.

It is not to be concealed that the epistles which remain for us to notice, two to Timothy and one to Titus, have, by a large number of critics, been assigned to another writer than St Paul. A single sentence from Dr. Farrar's "Life and Work of St Paul" (ii, 540) furnishes great aid towards the settlement of this question:

> If, indeed, St Paul was never liberated from his first Roman imprisonment, then the Pastoral Epistles [*as these three are called*] must be forgeries, for the attempts of Weiseler and others to prove that they might have been written during any *part* of the period covered by the narrative of the Acts—during the three years' stay at Ephesus, for instance, or the stay of eighteen months at Corinth—sink to the ground, not only under

the weight of their own arbitrary hypotheses, but even more from the state both of the church and of the mind and circumstances of the apostle, which these letters so definitely manifest.

The truth of this will commend itself to every one who carefully reads the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles. There is no room for such letters to have been written to Timothy or Titus. The first of these two young men only became known to St Paul towards the end of his first missionary tour at Lystra, where he was circumcised. He next appears as joining with St Paul at Corinth in sending the epistle to the Romans. He is named again in I Cor. (xvi 10) as being likely to come to Corinth. He also again appears as jointly with Paul writing the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, and in verse 19 of the first chapter is named as preaching in conjunction with St Paul and Silvanus.

In the Epistle to the Philippians (iii, 19), St Paul, writing from Rome, "trusts in the Lord to send Timotheus shortly unto you." In I Thessalonians (iii, 2), St Paul, wishing to be at Athens alone, sends Timotheus our brother to establish them; and, lastly, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (xiii, 23), St Paul (supposed to be the writer) ends the epistle as follows:

> Know ye that *our* brother Timothy is set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you.

We are left to imagine how these concluding words of the epistle harmonize with the subscription which makes Timothy convey this epistle to the Hebrews from Italy. To work these notices of Timothy into anything like a consecutive history would be a vain and unprofitable task. It is more to the point to consider how far the two epistles addressed to Timothy can be ascribed to St Paul as their writer. The difficulty of finding any time and place at which these letters could have been written, has probably been the reason why a tradition has arisen that St Paul, at the end of the two years named as the period of his sojourn at Rome, was released, and, having travelled to those places which would fit in with the contents of the three pastoral epistles, was again arrested, and finished his career by martyrdom at Rome. For the whole of this story there is not the slightest evidence, and the reasonable inference is that the epistles to Timothy, like the others, were put forth by the Church as encyclical documents, with the names of men and places arbitrarily affixed to them, that the Christians in various parts of the world might attach more importance to

their contents. It is not without weight that Marcion, who certainly paid great attention to biblical subjects, did not recognize the epistles to Timothy as justly comprised in the Christian canon.

2. It cannot escape the notice of readers that in this First Epistle to Timothy the offices of bishop and deacon are spoken of with great force, in such an advanced state of organization as hardly could have been formed by St Paul, much less made the subject of such instructions as are found in the whole of the third chapter of this epistle. The writer says:

If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. . . . . A bishop, then, must be blameless, the husband of one wife. . . . . Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife. [iii, 1-12.]

These details belong not to the few years during which St Paul was running over the Roman empire, to convert heathens and prepare the way not so much for a worldly hierarchy, but for a heavenly inheritance. The epistle was written several years later, when an outer organization was needful to promote more systematically the doctrines of the Christian religion.

It is in the last chapter of this epistle that we find marks of preachers and ministers assuming a pre-eminence among the faithful. The writer tells Timothy not to rebuke an elder, but entreat him as a father, and the younger men as brethren. Now, elder was at this time another name for bishop; it was at a much later date than the first century that the threefold order was established of bishops, priests, and deacons.

3. There is one more anachronism, more patent than the others, which shows that this first epistle belongs to a later date than that of Paul. There is abundant notice of heresy which certainly had not begun during the rapid ministry of St Paul. We read in the fourth chapter of the epistle:

The Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron. [iv, 1-2.]

And in the concluding sentence of the last chapter we have the plainest evidence on the question of these heresies. The writer thus addresses Timothy:

O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane *and* vain babblings, and oppositions of science, falsely

so called: which some professing have erred concerning the faith. [vi, 20-21.]

In this passage the Greek word for science, falsely so called, is *pseudōnumore ynōseōs;* but in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius (iii, 32) we are informed, on the authority of Hegesippus, that up to a certain time the Church remained pure and uncorrupt:

But when the holy choir of the apostles had met each with a different end of his life, and that generation had passed away of men who had been thought worthy to hear the divine wisdom with their very ears, then the company of godless error took its beginning through the deceit of erroneous teachers, who, seeing that none of the apostles remained, attempted now for the future with bare front to preach *science, falsely so called*, in opposition to the preaching of the truth. [*E. H.* iii, 32.]

11. SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

This epistle has the address and the subscription which here follow:

Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God, according to the promise of life which is in Christ Jesus, to Timothy, *my* dearly beloved son: Grace, mercy, *and* peace, from God the Father and Christ Jesus our Lord.

The second *epistle* unto Timotheus, ordained the first bishop of the church of the Ephesians, was written from Rome, when Paul was brought before Nero the second time.

It cannot be too often repeated that there is not the slightest authority for the subscription to this epistle, that St Paul was brought before Nero a second time. The only asserted authority for this is St Paul's vague mention of a first hearing; but this need not have been before Cæsar; and what he adds about the number of his adherents, whom he salutes, is rendered very doubtful, seeing that he speaks of Trophimus, whom he left sick so long before at Miletus, and that he invites Timothy to come to him before winter:

Tychicus have I sent to Ephesus. . . . . At my first answer no man stood with me, but all *men* forsook me. *I pray God* that it may not be laid to their charge. [II TIM. iv, 12, 16.]

Salute Prisca and Aquila, and the household of Onesiphorus. Erastus abode at Corinth; but Trophimus have I left at Miletum

sick. Do thy diligence to come before winter. Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia, and all the brethren. [II Tim. iv, 19-21.]

The epistle, if actually written or dictated by St Paul, can only have been written during the two final years at Rome, and it is most probable that St Paul was not spared when Nero put to torture and to death so many Christians accused of having set fire to the Roman city.

2. St Paul instructs Timothy to remind those whom he teaches "that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers." These words remind us of the caution found in the former epistle to Timothy as regards the heretics, as they are termed by orthodox writers. The names of these heretics are legion; a large number are mentioned by Eusebius, quoting from Hegesippus, as the passage has been already given in a former page (84) of this volume. We have here, also (ii, 17), two other names, Hymenæus and Philetus, "whose word," Paul saith, "will eat as doth a canker," and who seem to have held that "the resurrection had passed already." The more general name of Gnostics (*knowing ones*) has been given to many of these sects, all of whom, however, had some peculiar notions of their own. It is not necessary to point out any more peculiarities which sanction our assigning the second epistle to the same age as the first.

12. THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

This epistle is subscribed, "It was written to Titus, ordained the first bishop of the church of the Cretians, from Nicopolis of Macedonia." We are told in the Epistle to the Galatians (ii. 1-3) that St. Paul took Titus with him to Jerusalem, fourteen years after the former visit in which he abode fifteen days with Peter, and that Titus being a Greek, was not compelled to be circumcised. We read also in the Second Epistle to Timothy (iv, 10) that Titus is gone to Dalmatia. This is related by St Paul to have happened at the same time that Demas had forsaken him, "having loved this present world," but it is not necessarily to be inferred that Titus also forsook his friend and patron. The notices of Titus which are found elsewhere occur in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. St Paul first there names him as not having joined him in Troas (ii, 13), but later on in

the same epistle he says that Titus was with him in Macedonia (vii, 6), and had consented, at the solicitation of Paul, to accompany another of the brethren, whose praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches (viii, 18), to Corinth, where the Christian community were in need of consolation from some unpleasant matters which had taken place among them. We hear no more of Titus until we find this epistle addressed to him among the others which occur in our canon.

The address prefixed to this epistle is somewhat longer than is generally found in the others ascribed to Paul, and in it Titus is described as "mine own son after the common faith."

1. But that St Paul was ever in Crete with Titus can hardly be reconciled with the complaint which he made during his disastrous voyage to Italy, that he was not allowed by the captain of the ship to remain in Crete, and so escape the storm from which they suffered. We are therefore much at a loss to understand what follows:

> For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee. [i, 5.]

2. The whole tenour of the epistle is not what we should expect at so early a stage of the Christian ministry. "A bishop must be blameless," "the husband of one wife," would be more appropriate at a later period, when bishops were an established order; but St Paul tells us that he had commissioned Titus to appoint elders (presbyters) in every city. Was Titus, then, a bishop himself? If so, there were already bishops, priests, and deacons in the church; but this does not appear to have been the case at a date so early.

3. St Paul, however, if he never was in Crete, must be supposed to have studied Cretan literature, and perhaps to have read the poems of Epimenides, seeing that he quotes a hexameter line from that poet:

> *Krētes dei pseustai kaka thēria, gasteres argoi.*
>
> (The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies.)

This supposition must not readily be entertained. It is not likely that St Paul had ever read the poems of Epimenides, or of Callimachus, in whose works the same line occurs. But it is far from unlikely that Greek compilers of the Christian canon, representing Titus as a bishop of Crete, should adorn, with a quotation from a Cretan poet,

an epistle to which they prefixed the name of Paul, to whom such an ascription would be appropriate. The occurrence of a Greek verse here, as already said (p. 431), does not add probability to the theory that St Paul is to be accepted as the author.

4. It has been supposed that St Paul's visit to Crete in company with Titus may have been made during the three months that he spent in Greece, before he passed through Macedonia on his return from his third missionary tour. Those who propose this theory imagine that it was quite possible for such a visit to have been made within the space of three months. But such harmonizers seem to have forgotten that St Paul returned into Asia through Macedonia in order to escape the machinations of the Jews, "who laid wait for him as he was about to sail into Syria" (xx, 3). If St Paul visited Crete at this time, he would have had to go by sea on the very same route as would conduct him to Syria; and it may safely be said that he then had no intention of going to Crete at all. Nor does the name of Titus appear among the names of those who accompanied Paul through Macedonia: so difficult is it to trace the career of those early Christian teachers, if we set aside the conjectures of modern commentators to supply voids in the history, for which not the slightest foundation can be found.

5. The subject matter of the Epistle to Titus is not unworthy of an early Christian teacher, but even here it is not impossible to add some remarks. It is wonderful how, in so small a space, have been accumulated the duties of almost every class of society. Old men and maidens, husbands and wives, have their duties all marked out clearly; which would, perhaps, have been more appropriate if directed to an older man. For Titus was certainly very young when first received by Paul, and was still probably little beyond the normal age of a young man.

6. Here also we read of the foolish questions, genealogies, contentions, and strivings against the law (iii, 9), which, as pointed out in the other epistles, indicate the Gnosticism which had not begun in the time of Paul, but only late in the next generation after him.

13. EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

The epistle which is thus headed is subscribed as sent "from Rome by Onesimus, a servant," or, more accurately,

a slave. According to this, we may suppose that it was written during the two years which St Paul spent in his own house at Rome, and which, without any doubt, were the last of his life. Some have suggested that it may have been written during the two years that St Paul spent as a prisoner in Cæsarea, before he was sent to Rome; but this is less likely, and may be set aside. It is not known who Philemon was, but as Onesimus was evidently his slave, and the same who is named in the Epistle to the Colossians, we may take it for certain that Philemon was an inhabitant of the city of Colossæ. Nothing is said of him elsewhere in any of the epistles, and all that we know of him is based on the slight notice which is derived from the mention of his runaway slave. The historical subject of this writing is simple. Onesimus, a slave in the house of Philemon, has run away from his master, and reappears at Rome, where, somehow or other, he obtains the intercession of St Paul, who sends him back with this letter, and in company with others who bear letters to the Ephesians and the Philippians, written, we must suppose, at the same time from Rome. But what was the offence which Onesimus had committed which led him to commit the still greater offence of running away from his master? The Apostle answers this question thus:

If he hath wronged thee, or oweth *thee* aught, put that on mine account. I, Paul, have written *it* with mine own hand, I will repay *it*. [18-19.]

At the end of the epistle are the following salutations, all of which occur also in the Epistle to the Colossians:

There salute thee Epaphras, my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus; Marcus, Aristarchus, Demas, Lucas, my fellow-labourers. [23-24.]

In so short an epistle as this we can scarcely find any evidence by which its genuineness may be tested. And yet there are many points which suggest the probability that it was written as a short treatise teaching, by an example, Christian forgiveness and equality in the sight of God. As an illustration of such principles, we do not expect perfect harmony of parts; but if this is to be considered a genuine work of St Paul's, we may demur to many peculiarities which do not seem to be very probable.

1. If Onesimus stole, as is thought, from his master at Colossæ, and ran away to escape punishment, is it possible that he could have found his way down to the coast of Asia

Minor, have crossed the Ægean Sea, the whole continent of Greece, the Adriatic Sea, and then the breadth of Italy, and so have come to Rome, many hundred miles from his place of starting?

2. We have no notice of any relations subsisting between St Paul and Philemon, and such notice might, perhaps, have been expected, seeing that, together with this short letter to Philemon, another was sent to the Colossians in general, of whom we might suppose, from the terms of approbation in which St Paul speaks of him, Philemon was a distinguished member.

3. But another question may be asked, to which it will be difficult to find an answer. Philemon was distinguished by his "love and faith towards the Lord Jesus, and toward all saints;" and yet he is the owner of slaves, one of whom commits some offence involving dishonesty (*ēdikēse*), and runs away to Rome, where he is converted by St Paul, and sent back to his master. Why is it that Philemon allowed his slave to continue a heathen, whilst dwelling in his own household, and not to embrace Christianity, until he might be thought to do it from the motive of self-preservation? And how can it be shown that St Paul's earnestness on behalf of his convert was better founded than that of others in every age whose benevolence has been taken advantage of and deceived? Modern experience does not sanction this narrative as a matter of historical fact, but only as a moral illustration of a great Christian principle, whether coming from St Paul himself or from others using his name, as was often done in such cases with less suspicion of dishonesty than the tone of society at present would recognize.

4. There is a fourth point in this epistle which does not give it much validity: the words, "I, Paul, have written it with mine own hand." Similar acknowledgments occur in other epistles, and have been thought to owe their origin to the fact that spurious epistles are named as current even in the time of St Paul himself, which certainly is not likely, and yet may have given rise to these repeated claims of genuineness at a later date. The return of Onesimus as a convert must have become known to the fraternity at Colossæ; and the letter, which was written to urge on Philemon the forgiveness of his slave, would derive no additional confirmation, if St Paul wrote it, from his saying that he wrote it.

5. There is a peculiarity in this short letter which may be named, even if some should think that it is not at all un-

worthy of a place in speaking of a matter in which perhaps the punishment of death might be inflicted. The name Onesimus means profitable, and the writer puns upon this name more than once, and on the word which contrasts with it, and even extends the pun to the name of Christ, from which are compounded two opposing words *euchrestos*, profitable, and *achrestos*, unprofitable. The tone of the epistle would have been more serious if divested of these grammatical references.

Among the peculiar passages found in this short epistle is the following:

Prepare me also a lodging; for I trust that through your prayers I shall be given unto you. [22.]

It is certainly remarkable that St Paul, whilst writing on general topics to the inhabitants of Colossæ and of Philippi, at the same time that he was sending a short private letter to Philemon, should request the last-named to prepare a lodging for him, as soon as he should be liberated from his imprisonment. Colossæ and Philippi are far apart, the former an inland town in Asia, the latter a seaport in Europe. It is observable in the early history of the Church that places wide apart are treated as if nearly connected, and within easy distance one of another. St Paul himself, according to the accounts which have come down to us, travelled over more land, and visited many more cities, than would appear possible to those who should inquire minutely into the geography of the world in ancient times. The long space of time which his voyage from Palestine to Rome occupied does not tell much in favour of leisure to be employed in writing or learning Greek, when we have deducted the time employed in travelling, in preaching, and other missionary labours. But that he should contemplate going to Colossæ and hiring a lodging there is a less likely feature of his relations with Colossæ or with Philemon than many other incidents of his apostolical career.

6. Besides the foregoing statement of difficulties which attend on the belief in the authenticity of this epistle, it may be briefly mentioned that the German critic Baur quotes several words and expressions which he considers to be of what he terms an unPauline character. These may without harm be omitted from our present inquiry.

We may, however, notice an attempt which has been made to establish a comparison between this epistle of St

Paul and one which appears among the letters of the younger Pliny, written not long after the death of St Paul himself.

A freedman, still living in the family of Sabinianus, had offended his master, who, he thought, would be angry with him. So he went to the house of Pliny, and obtained from him a letter to his master, which the freedman carried to Sabinianus. We are not told the result, but the difference between this and the case of Onesimus is great. The slave travels hundreds of miles, and passes with St Paul some time, during which he is converted, and then sent back. The freedman, his master Sabinianus, and Pliny all live in Rome, or not far off, and there is nothing to show that Sabinianus was more than vexed at what had happened, although Pliny admits that he was justly angry. The letter occurs in the Epistles of Pliny (ix, 21), and we may infer that it restored the man to his master, who had always loved him.

§ 14. EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

It has been thought by most commentators and critics that this is not truly an epistle at all, but rather a work containing a series of exhortations to the discharge of Christian duties, and reminders of the favour which God had at sundry times bestowed upon the Israelitish people. The absence of any address pointing out for whose use it was written, divests it wholly of the epistolary form, and furnishes without doubt a strong support of the opinion just stated; whilst the subscription, "Written to the Hebrews by Timotheus," would furnish sufficient ground for the possibility of its having been sent by Paul through Timotheus, his messenger to the Hebrews, whoever these may have been, whether those who resided in Jerusalem, or some other body of Jews connected or unconnected with St Paul, as the case might be. Eusebius (E. H. vi, 14) quotes from Clement of Alexandria, from Origen, and from Clement of Rome. The first of these asserts that

> The Epistle to the Hebrews was written by Paul to the Hebrews in the Hebrew tongue, but that it was carefully translated by Luke, and published among the Greeks.

Clement considers that this is confirmed by the similarity of style between it and the Acts of the Apostles. No other critic, however, has noticed this similarity of style, nor has much value been attached to the reason why it does not bear before it the name of Paul, as is the case with his other epistles. Clement suggests that, if Paul had prefixed his name, the Hebrews, being prejudiced against him, would never have read the epistle; but in the next sentence, as quoted by Eusebius, a very different reason is suggested:

> Since our Lord, who was the apostle of the Almighty, was sent to the Hebrews, Paul, by reason of his inferiority, as if sent to the Gentiles, did not subscribe himself an apostle to the Hebrews; both out of reverence for the Lord, and because he wrote of his abundance to the Hebrews, as a herald and apostle of the Gentiles.

The so-called heretic, Marcion, did not admit either Titus or the Hebrews into his canon, and his opinion cannot be altogether set aside on the score of his heresy, for he was a laborious and able critic, against whom no charge of perverting the truth has ever been established. Indeed, until Jerome and Augustine, in the fourth century, added the weight of their names to support its authenticity, it would probably long ago have ceased to be one of the articles contained in our canon of the New Testament.

These opinions—for they are nothing better—are enough to show that if little is known about the thirteen epistles ascribed to Paul, nothing at all is known about that which is called the Epistle to the Hebrews, although with that extreme conservatism which often perpetuates what is false as well as what is true, this is still kept in our Scriptures, not only as an epistle, but still bearing the name of Paul as its writer. But those who do not acknowledge it as a work of Paul would do well to abstain from naming any writer at all; for if, with Dr. Farrar, we profess our belief that it was the work of Apollos, we gain no advantage from such an ascription. The opinion is a mere conjecture, for which no single fact can be brought in support, and the authority of it as a canonical work is certainly not raised in the opinion of readers by substituting the name of Apollos for that of Paul. These remarks seem to be all that is necessary about a work written in Greek for the use of the native Hebrews, whether in Jerusalem, as is most probable, or elsewhere. That particular class of native Hebrews would be the least

adapted to receive or to read a work written in Greek; and it seems difficult to say when such a work would be appropriate, except at a late period when the whole of the Eastern empire were united in the new Christian doctrines, in a language which had then become the language of the canon and of religion throughout the whole of the Roman empire.*

* Some attempt has been made both to substantiate and to impugn the authenticity of Hebrews from certain texts in which the ceremonies of the Temple Service are named, but they are obscurely worded, and furnish no solid ground whatever.

INDEX

OF

PASSAGES QUOTED FROM THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

MATTHEW.

	PAGE
i, 20	151
iv, 18	193
ix, 9	266
x, 2–4	173
— 8	174
— 14	36
— 23	138
xii, 46	153
xiii, 55	152
xvi, 17	198
— 28	137
xxiii, 36	138
xxiv, 29–31	138
xxvi, 7	156
— 8	293
— 14–23	294
— 36	228
— 47–50	296
xvii, 3–8	297
— 17	163
— 19	122
— 55–56	154, 233
xxviii, 1	157

MARK.

	PAGE
ii, 14-15	266
iii, 13	172
— 16–19	173
— 31	153
vi, 2	152
— 7	173
— 8	174
— 11	36
viii, 33	203
ix, 11	137
x, 37–38	226
xiii, 3	193
— 30	138
xiv, 3	156
— 4–5	293
— 10–11	294
xv, 40	154
xvi, 1	157
— 7	203

LUKE.

	PAGE
i, 1	34
— 26	122
— 35	151
iv, 13–16	173
— 22	152
— 27	152
v, 3–11	194
— 27–29	266
vi, 13–16	173
vii, 36	156
viii, 1	155
— 5	399
— 19	153
ix, 1	174
— 5	35
— 27	138
— 31	225
— 39–42	156
— 52	227
x, 4	175
— 10	175
— 48	175
xix, 11	139
xxi, 32	138
xxii, 1–5, 21	295
— 26	226
— 31	204
— 48	297
xxiii, 49	153
xxiv, 1–10	157

JOHN.

	PAGE
i, 41	196

PAGE
i, 43–44 257
— 45 261
ii, 1–2 154
vi, 41–42, 60–66 .. 153
vi, 71 293
vii, 35 45
xi, 2–20 156
— 14–16 263
xii, 2 156
— 6 293
— 20–22 .. 42, 257
— 36 246
xiii, 2 294
— 26–30 295
xiv, 5 264
— 9 258
xix, 25 154
xx, 1 157
xxi, 2 .. .. 201, 261
— 24 240
— 25 241

ACTS.

i, 9–11 15
— 13 173
— 16–20 298
— 23–26 301
— 41–47 17
ii, 2, 4 126
— 6 139
— 10–11 15
— 13 173
— 14 515
— 41–47 .. 12, 17, 179
— 46 .. .. 12, 179
iii, 7 18
— 19 140
iv, 13 169
— 31–37 19
v, 17–20 20
vi, 1 46
— 5 183
— 9–15 21
vii, 45 161
— 48–55 188
viii, 1 180
— 3 .. .. 208, 317
— 5, 6, 7, 26 .. 190
— 9, 11 113
— 39–40 191
ix, 3–9 318
— 26, 27, 29 321
— 30 324
— 32–34 209
— 36–40 .. .. 191, 209
x, 2 211
— 3 124
— 10–15 211
x, 35 246
— 40–41 210
— 44 212
xi, 4, 18 213
— 20 46
— 24 325
— 25–30 23
xii, 1–2 .. .. 24, 215
— 9–11 214
— 12 .. .. 167, 303
— 14–16 214
— 25 303
— 37–42 246
xiii, 1–5 25
— 6–11 114
— 50–51 .. 36, 328
xiv, 1 42
— 5 329
xv, 1 .. .. 216, 330
— 5, 19–20 331
— 37–39 304
xvi, 1–3 42
— 4 334
— 10–12 335
— 26 336
xvii, 1–3 29
— 4 42
— 11 338
— 12 42
— 16, 18–19 .. 339
— 28 399
— 32–34 340
xviii, 4 42
— 6–10 343
— 14–16 344
— 17 42
— 21–22, 28 .. 345
xix, 10, 17, 29 42, 347
— 16, 22 348
— 35, 37 349
xx, 4 30
— 6 350
— 10–12 351
— 21 42
— 22–25 351
— 28 352
— 33, 35 353
xxi, 8 189
— 13 354
— 18 282
— 20–22, 23–26 .. 355
— 25 241
— 28 42
— 30–31, 38–39 .. 356
xxii, 3 357
— 6–11 318
— 16–17 323
— 27–28 357
xxiii, 3 359
xxiii, 11 378
— 12–13 360
— 27–30 361
xxiv, 26 363
xxv, 7, 18–19 364
— 26–27 365
xxvi, 4 366
— 12–16 318
— 19–20 323
— 22–23 366
xxvii, 1–3 .. 29, 368
— 11 369
— 24–26 370
xxviii, 8–10 372
— 21–23 373
— 30–31 374

ROMANS.

i, 10–15 381
— 13 387
— 14–16 43
ii, 9–10 45
iii, 9 45
vi, 11 387
ix, 20, 22 414
x, 12 43
xi, 1 380
xiii, 11 141
xiv, 6 157
xv, 14 381
— 20, 26–28 382

I CORINTHIANS.

i, 12–13 .. .. 387, 392
— 22–24 43
— 27 169
iv, 13, 37 386
vii, 40 146
x, 16, 21 395
— 32 46
xi, 23–26 394
xii, 8 398
— 13 46
— 28 400
xiv, 26 403
— 39 132
xv, 3–8 .. .. 282, 395
— 12 403
— 51 142

II CORINTHIANS.

i, 18 387
vii, 12, 13 401
x, 10 403
— 15–16 30
xi, 22 382
— 23, 28 413

PAGE

xi, 32, 33.. 402

GALATIANS.

i, 1.. 405
— 13 387
— 14 380
— 16, 20.. 322
— 18–19.. 278
ii, 3 43
— 12 279
iii, 28 43
vi, 11 387

EPHESIANS.

i, 15, 16.. 421
iii, 9, 10.. 422

PHILIPPIANS.

iii, 5 379
iv, 3 60
— 5 142

COLOSSIANS.

i, 16, 17.. 422
iii, 11 43
iv, 10 30
— 14 304
— 16, 18 420

PAGE

xi, 10–11.. 161
— 14 309

I THESSALONIANS.

i, 6, 7 423
iv, 14 142

II THESSALONIANS.

ii, 1–4 143
iii, 7, 8.. 426

I TIMOTHY.

iii, 1–12.. 428

II TIMOTHY.

iv, 10 309
— 11 304
— 14 142
— 12, 16.. 429

TITUS.

i, 12 399

PHILEMON.

23–24 30
18, 19, 23, 24 .. 433

HEBREWS.

iv, 8 161

PAGE

x, 36 143
xiii, 22 387

JAMES.

v, 8 143

I PETER.

i, 13 143
iv, 4–7 143
v, 13 218

II PETER.

i, 16; iii, 4, 8 .. 144
iii, 9, 10–14 145
— 15–16.. 219

I JOHN.

ii, 18 145
v, 6–8 247

REVELATION.

i, 1–3 251
— 7 146
ii, 4, 6 416
iii, 15, 16 416
xvii, 9–12 256
xxii, 8 251
— 18–19 253

T. G. JOHNSON, Printer, 121, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

Nazarene Theological College
B12942

Books are to be returned on or before
the last date below

LIBREX —

270.1
G472a
AUTHOR 1003 Giles, John Allen

TITLE Apostolical Records of

Early Christianity

Date	Name

270.1
G472a
1003

Giles

BRITISH ISLES NAZARENE
LIBRARY
COLLEGE